to be 1/2 D. like the
fraction of 1.2+3/10.
finish last sec

257

ELEMENTS

OF

DOGMATIC HISTORY.

BY WILLIAM MUENSCHER, S. T. D.

AND ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT MARBURG.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND EDITION OF THE ORIGINAL GERMAN.

BY JAMES MURDOCK, D. D.

NEW-HAVEN,

PUBLISHED BY A. H. MALTBY.

1830.

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, SS.

L. S. BE IT REMEMBERED, That on the second day of July, in the fifty-fourth year of the Independence of the United States of America, A. H. MALTBY, of the said District, hath deposited in this office, the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as proprietor, in the words following, to wit:—

"Elements of Dogmatic History. By William Muenscher, S. T. D. and ordinary Professor of Theology at Marburg. Translated from the second edition of the Original German, by James Murdock, D. D."

In conformity to the Act of Congress of the United States, entitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned." And also to the Act, entitled, "An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled, 'An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned,' and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

CHA'S A. INGERSOLL,
Clerk of the District of Connecticut.

A true copy of Record, examined and sealed by me,

CHA'S A. INGERSOLL,
Clerk of the District of Connecticut.

BALDWIN AND TREADWAY, PRINT.

RBR
Jantz
#823

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

This elementary work was primarily intended for use in the author's lectures; and was calculated especially to aid his hearers. Yet it may perhaps be serviceable to others, by presenting to them a rapid glance over the whole field of dogmatic history. The principles on which it is drawn up, are the same as those followed by the author, in his Elements of Church History; and as he has there explained those principles, in the preface, he will not repeat them here. Yet some few observations will be added.

It was his great object, to give a plain, simple and dense statement. Therefore only three periods of time are assumed; and the facts are recapitulated in so unconstrained a manner, that uniformity in the mode of treating the several periods was intentionally disregarded. The facts also, are rather indicated, than fully displayed. The author flatters himself however, that the discerning will perceive a fixed plan, running through the work; and will understand, that a different mode of treating the successive periods, arose from the effort, to give the exact mode of thinking and reasoning, in each. If his aim to be very concise, should here and there produce obscurity, or indefiniteness, the oral instructions of the teacher must remove the former, and give precision to the latter.

In the first period, the passages from the fathers, which might serve as vouchers, are with few exceptions omitted; and the reader is referred to the author's Manual for

them.* In the second period also, the passages in the scholastic writers, are but seldom pointed out; because they could be of little service to beginners; and because, those who are acquainted with these writers, can easily find the passages; their systems having generally the same arrangement. Yet wherever the experienced would be at a loss, to determine on what authority an assertion rests, the passage is expressly named. In the third period, a greater number of citations was necessary: and the author confesses, that he has often doubted, whether too many, or too few, were introduced. It has always been his rule, however, in making the selection of authorities, to regard the historical value, and not the doctrinal importance of the passages.

The author wishes that intelligent judges, if they deem this work worth their examining, would acquaint him with its defects, and thus facilitate its improvement.

To this second edition, the literary notices are subjoined, which the venerated author had written in the margin of his copy; and likewise, such as the editor deemed necessary, in order to bring down the literature to the time of the publication.

---

* On the most important sections, the translator has introduced the principal references of the Manual into this compendium. They are distinguished, by being connected with the text by means of the common numerals.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The work here offered to American theologians, is supposed, to be unlike any thing, that has ever appeared before the English public. It is an *outline* of a *general history* of the *christian faith*, with copious *references* to authorities and authors who have treated on the subjects.

1. It is an *outline* merely; not a full history. For it mentions only the general facts; and states them, in the most concise manner. It was designed to be the text merely, on which a lecturer might expatiate.

2. It is a *general* history; that is, one that covers the whole subject of dogmatic theology, or systematic divinity; and not the history of one, or of a few, particular doctrines only.

3. It is purely a *history*. For the author did not design, to discriminate between true and false doctrines; to elucidate, confirm, and recommend the former, and to confute and set a mark upon the latter. He aims to be the mere historian of facts; or to narrate, truly and candidly, what doctrines were discussed, and how they were stated, defended and attacked, and by whom; without laboring to prepossess the reader, either for, or against, any doctrine. In other words, he professes to assume the attitude of a *witness* in a court, whose duty it is, to state the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, without regarding the interests of either of the litigating parties; and not the part of an *advocate*, whose office it is, to defend the cause

of his client, in the best manner the case will admit. This mode of composing dogmatic histories, it is believed, will be altogether new, to most theologians in this country; for, all the histories written previously to the middle of the last century, and all written since, in the English language, whether they were histories of particular doctrines, as those of the trinity, infant baptism, the Lord's supper, predestination, free grace, &c. or histories of all the doctrines in a system of theology, were manifestly written for the express purpose, either of confirming, or confuting, a particular creed: and of course, the writers, not only collect all the testimonies they can, on one side of the subject, and make the most of them, and enumerate some on the opposite side, placing them in the most unfavorable light; but they resort to all the arts of rhetoric and logic, to persuade their readers to adopt the opinions they defend, and to reject those which they condemn. Such historians are, as truly *polemic* writers, as if they had chosen other than historical arguments, with which to accomplish their party purposes. Of this character is Dr. Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity; and also the histories of the Trinity, by Christopher Sandis, Dr. Alex, Bishop Bull, and others; the histories of infant baptism, by Wall, Gale, Robertson &c. and numerous other dogmatic histories.

4. This work is a history of the *faith* of such as have borne the christian name, or of their speculative belief, their dogmatic theology; and not of their practical theology, their conduct, their piety, their rites of worship, their ecclesiastical polity, &c. And

5. It contains *references* to the principal sources of evi-

dence for the facts stated, and lists of modern writers of different communities, who may be consulted on the several subjects.

In the selection of the facts to be narrated, and in his references to authors, the writer of this work, had in view the young theologians of Germany; for whose use the book was intended. An American student would be better pleased with the work, had the author been more full and particular, on the doctrines most controverted in this country; and if he had developed farther the doctrinal views and arguments of the English, Scotch, and American divines; and made more references to their writings. Yet the translator has not deemed it expedient, to enlarge the work, by additions of this nature, except by a very few references. Nor has he curtailed the numerous references to German writers; for to those who make no use of them, they can do no harm; and to others, they may at least serve to show, what subjects have engaged most attention in Germany, and how the theologians of that country, range themselves on the different sides of most questions there discussed. By pursuing this course, and giving a plain translation of the original, he has presented the English reader, with the entire work of Dr. Münscher, as near as possible in its original form.

The author of this work, Dr. William Muenscher, was born at Hersfeld, on the 11th of March 1766; became a stated preacher, in the cathedral church in his native place, till the age of 26, when he was made Professor in ordinary, in the university of Marburg in Hesse-Cassel, and consistorial councillor there, for 22 years, or till his death, 28th of July, 1814. He composed the preface to a popular edition of Luther's bible; and a

volume of printed sermons, which are said to be characterized by their religious fervor, and by the constant and happy use made of the holy scriptures. He was also the principal conductor of a journal, devoted to the interests of schools and religion: but his greatest and most noted work, was his Manual of Dogmatic History, in IV. volumes 8vo. extending over the first six centuries. Beside these, he composed an Elementary Church History, and the work here presented to the public. Of his large work, C. F. L. Simon, in his Continuation of Noesselt's Guide to the Literature of Theology, says, (Sec. 299,) "the author has happily combined the chronological order, with that of the relations of things; and the whole work is distinguished, alike, for the persevering, learned, and critical industry, manifested in collecting the materials; and for the solidity and independence of judgment, with which they are methodically arranged, and agreeably expressed." And he adds: "the same commendation is due to the author's Elements of Dogmatic history." Brettschneider, in his Entwickelung der Dogmatik, p. 99, ed. 2d, says of the Manual: "It is to be regarded as *(hauptwerk)* the *best work* on the subject." The Elements, notwithstanding it had to contend with several rival works, has, since its first appearance in 1811, gone through three editions in Germany, without alteration,—two of them since the author's death; and it is still in high reputation, in that country.

The theological sentiments of Dr. Muenscher, the translator regrets, that he is not able definitely to state; since a knowledge of them, might serve to show, where, and how, the author's prepossessions were most likely to mislead him. In several passages of this work, as well

as of the Manual, the translator thought he discovered indications of much laxer views in theology, than his own. Yet he supposes, Dr. Münscher was classed, by his countrymen, with Michaelis, Doederlein, Planck, and others; who stood on middle ground, between the ancient, pure Lutheranism, and the modern neology of Germany. After all, the private opinions, or the commendations and censures of the writer, which occasioually escape from him unconsciously, ought not to influence the reader. It is his *facts*, and his arguments only, that deserve regard. And these, he is supposed to state, with as much fidelity, and impartiality, as reasonably can be expected, from an able and honest man, who felt his reputation to be staked on the correctness of his narration.

New-Haven, June 1, 1830.

CONTENTS.

Page.

PREFACE, ... 3
Translator's Preface, ... 5

INTRODUCTION, p. 17—23.

SEC. 1. Doctrines, ... 17
2. Changes in doctrines, ... 17
3. Dogmatic History, ... 18
4. Its use, ... 18
5. Its sources, ... 19
6. Its laws, ... 19
7. Its literature, ... 20
8. Its form or method, ... 22

FIRST PERIOD. The early ages. A. D. 1–600. p. 24–87.

PART I. The general history. p. 24–33.

9. Jesus Christ, ... 24
10. The Apostles, ... 25
11. The early Christians, ... 25
12. The church and its creed, ... 26
13. The received theology, ... 26
14. Estimation of the Bible, ... 27
15. Use of the Bible, ... 27
16. Tradition, ... 28
17. Philosophy, ... 29
18. Theologians, ... 30
19. Origen, ... 30
20. Establishment of Christianity, ... 31
21. Religious controversies, ... 31
22. Systems of theology, ... 32
23. Decline of theological learning, ... 32

PART II. History of particular doctrines. p. 33–87.

CHAP. I. The kingdom of Christ. p. 33–41.

24. Origin of the idea of it, ... 33
25. Chiliasm, ... 34
26. Last struggles of chiliasm, ... 34
27. Resurrection connected with chiliasm, ... 35
28. This gross theory opposed, ... 36
29. Subsequent history of the doctrine, ... 36

Page.

30. Intermediate state, ... 37
31. Modifications of the doctrine, . . 38
32. Purgatory fully established, . . 38
33. Hell and the damned, . . . 39
34. The church, ... 40
35. Its unity, ... 41
36. Marks of the true church, . . 41

Chap. II. Doctrine of Angels and Devils. p. 42–45.

37. Existence of Angels, . . . 42
38. Their offices, ... 42
39. Their condition, ... 43
40. Invocation of them, . . . 43
41. Apostacy of Angels, ... 44
42. Power of evil spirits, . . . 44
43. Their prospects, ... 44

Chap. III. The truth of Christianity. p. 45–48.

44. Introduction, ... 45
45. Attacks on Pagans, ... 46
46. Evidences of Christianity, . . 46
47. Prophecy and Miracles, . . . 46
48. Other external proofs, . . . 47
49. Objections to Christianity, . . . 47
50. Objections to its nature and its sacred books, 48
51. Objections to the conduct and influence of Christians, ... 48
52. Neglect of Apologetics, . . . 48

Chap. IV. Being and character of God. p. 47–53.

53. Occasion for attending to the subject, . 49
54. Proof of the existence of a God, . . 49
55. The unity of God, . . . 50
56. The nature of God, ... 50
57. The attributes of God, . . . 51
58. Creation, ... 51
59. The design of creation, . . . 51
60. Providence, ... 52
61. Theodicée, or origin of evil, . . 52

Chap. V. The Trinity. p. 53–63.

62. General belief of Christians, . . 54
63. The Unitarians, ... 54
64. The Trinitarians, ... 55
65. Source of their theory, . . . 55
66. Irenaeus and Tertullian, . . . 56
67. Clement and Origen, . . . 56

Page.
68. Dionysius Alex. and Dionysius Rom. . 57
69. Rise of the Arian controversy, . . 58
70. The Council of Nice, . . . 58
71. Consequences of the Council, . . 59
72. Arian parties, ... 59
73. Marcellus and Photinus, . . 60
74. Athanasian system, . . . 60
75. Triumph of this doctrine, . . 60
76. Fuller statement of the doctrine, . . 61
77. Subsequent statements, . . . 62

Chap. VI. The person of Christ. p. 63–67.

78. First germs of the doctrine, . . . 63
79. Its developement, . . . 64
80. The natures of Christ, . . . 64
81. Nestorius and Cyril, . . . 65
82. Council of Ephesus, . . . 65
83. Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, . 65
84. Subsequent contests, . . . 66

Chap. VII. Redemption by Jesus Christ. p. 68–82.

85. General doctrine of the church, . . 68
86. The nature of man, . . . 68
87. Endowments of man, . . . 69
88. Origin and propagation of sin, Greek Fathers, 70
89. Do. Latin Fathers, before Augustine, . 72
90. Early doctrine concerning grace, . 72
91. Controversy of Augustine with Pelagius, . 74
92. The first point; Sin, . . . 75
93. Second point; Grace and free will, . 76
94. Third point; Election, . . . 76
95. History of the doctrine, after Augustine, . 77
96. What Chsist has done for men, . 78
97. Effects of Christ's death, . . . 78
98. Forgiveness of sin, . . . 80

Chap. VIII. The Sacraments. p. 82–87.

99. Baptism, ... 82
100. Infant Baptism, ... 83
101. Baptism of heretics, . . . 84
102. Lord's Supper, ... 84
103. Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, . . 85
104. Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, . 86
105. On the Sacraments in general, . . 86

Second Period. Middle ages. A. D. 600—1517. p. 88–128.

Part I. The general history. p. 88–96.

Page.

106. Theology of the Greeks, at the beginning of the period, ... 88
107. John Damascenus, ... 88
108. Greek Theology, subsequently, . . 89
109. State of theology among the Latins, . 89
110. Age of Charlemagne, . . . 90
111. Preparatory steps to scholastic theology, . 90
112. Anselm and Hildebert, . . . 92
113. Contest respecting philosophic theology, . 92
114. Further advances of scholastic theology, 93
115. Influence of the Monastic Orders on scholastic theology, ... 94
116. The later Scholastics, ... 95
117. Causes of the downfall of scholastic theology, 96

PART II. History of particular doctrines. p. 97–128.

CHAP. I. Cultivation of doctrines previously defined. p. 97–104.

118. The being of God, ... 97
119. The nature of God, ... 98
120. The Trinity, ... 98
121. Creation and Angels, ... 99
122. Doctrine of Providence, . . . 99
123. Person of Christ, ... 100
124. Man, particularly his soul, . . . 101
125. Resurrection and general judgment, . 102
126. Truth of Christianity, . . . 102
127. The holy Scriptures, . . . 103

CHAP. II. Developement of doctrines not before defined. p. 104–128.

128. Procession of the Holy Spirit, . . . 104
129. Doctrine of sin and grace, and the kindred doctrines; in the Greek church, . 105
130. In the Latin church, . . . 105
131. Doctrine of the Scholastics, concerning sin, 106
132. Sinless conception of Mary, . . . 107
133. Doctrine concerning grace, . . 108
134. Predestination, ... 109
135. Redemption by Christ, . . . 110
136. Faith and good works, . . . 111
137. Adoration of saints and of Mary, . 111
138. The Sacraments, in general, . . . 112
139. Baptism, ... 114
140. Confirmation, ... 115
141. Lord's Supper, ... 116
142. Transmutation in the Lord's Supper, . 116
143. Contet with Berengarius, . . 118

Page.
144. Scholastics and Canonists, . . 119
145. Further determinations, . . 120
146. Consequences of the doctrine of transubstantiation, 121
147. The Mass, . . . 121
148. Sacrament of Penance, . . 122
149. Remission of satisfaction. Indulgences, 124
150. Sacrament of extreme unction, . 125
151. Sacrament of ordination, . . 126
152. Sacrament of marriage, . . 126
153. State of departed souls, . . 127
154. Doctrine concerning the church, . 128

Third Period. Modern times, A. D. 1517—1800. p. 129–203.

Part I. General view of the changes in doctrinal theology. p. 129–151.

155. Causes of new modifications in theology, 129
156. Introduction of the reformation, . 130
157. Protestant systems of theology, . 131
158. Reaction upon the Catholic church, . 132
159. Completion of the Lutheran system of faith, 133
160. Variations of doctrine in the Reformed church, 135
161. Attempts of the Reformed to improve their theology, . . . 135
162. Achievements of Spener, in regard to the Lutheran theology, . . . 137
163. Influence of the Wolfian philosophy, 138
164. Protestant theology, out of Germany, . 140
165. New formation of the Protestant theology, 141
166. Influence of the Kantean philosophy, . 145
167. The theology of other churches, . 149

Part II. History of particular doctrines. p. 151–203.

Chap. I. The foundations of all religion, and of the Christian religion in particular. 151–166.

168. Doctrine concerning God, . . 151
169. More recent history of this doctrine, . 153
170. Doctrine of Providence, . . 154
171. Immortality of the soul, . . 156
172. Belief in revelation, . . 157
173. Most recent history of belief in Revelation, 160
174. Miracles and prophecy, . . 161
175. Views concerning the holy Scriptures, 164
176. Recent views in Germany, . . 165

Page.

CHAP. II. Views and explanations of diverse Christian doctrines. p. 166–203.

177. Various first principles of Christianity, 166
178. Opinions on the importance of religious doctrines, 168
179. Doctrine of the Trinity, . . 169
180. Views of modern German divines, . . 171
181. Doctrine of creation, . . 172
182. Doctrine concerning Angels, . 173
183. Of the person of Christ, . . 174
184. Doctrine concerning the first men, . 175
185. Hereditary sin, . . . 176
186. Grace and predestination, . 178
187. Continuation, . . . 179
188. Further disagreement in the Reformed churches, respecting these doctrines, . 180
189. History of these doctrines in the Catholic church, 181
190. Influences of the word of God, . . 183
191. Most recent form of the doctrine of grace, 184
192. Redemption by Christ, . . 184
193. Continuation, . . . 185
194. Justification, . . . 187
195. Continuation, . . . 188
196. Faith and works, . . 189
197. Penance, . . . 190
198. The Sacraments, . . 191
199. Baptism, . . . 192
200. Common doctrine of the Protestants, respecting the Lord's supper, . . 194
201. Dissension among Protestants during Luther's life, 195
202. Progress of the controversy after Luther's death, 196
203. Later history of this doctrine, . . 197
204. The church, . . . 198
205. State of departed souls, . . 199
206. Resurrection and general judgment, . 201
207. Salvation and damnation, . . 202

INTRODUCTION.

Writers. Christian Fr. Walch, Thoughts on the history of religious opinions, (in German) 2d edition. Gottingen, 1764, 8vo.

Chr. Fried. Roesleri Diss. de Theoria Historiæ Dogmatum. Tubing. P. I. 1796. P. II. 1798. 4to.

Ideas on the extent and mode of treating Dogmatical History, (in German) by *W. K. L. Ziegler*—in *Gabler's* Neuesten Theol. Journal. AD. 1798, vol. II. p. 325—58.

Sec. 1. *Doctrines.*

By the word *doctrines*, the ancient writers understood sometimes, religious truths in general, and sometimes, the theoretical principles of the christian religion, in opposition to its practical precepts. The word has also been used to denote *explanations* and *opinions* respecting religious truths. The modern use of the term, makes it equivalent to *articles of faith.* Received doctrines (kirchliche Dogmen) are those which are admitted by some entire christian community.

References. Suicer, Thesaur. Eccles. tom. I. p. 932. *Cyrilli Hieros.* Catech. IV. Sec. 2. p. 52. *Gregorii Nyss.* Ep. VI. in *Gallandi* Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. VI. p. 631. A peculiar use of the word occurs in *Basil.* Opp. tom. III. p. 54—56.

Sec. 2. *Changes in regard to Doctrines.*

The christian doctrines have undergone innumerable changes, since their first appearance; in regard to the matter of them, the manner of stating and defending them, the degree of importance attached to them, and the arrangement and exhibition of them. The causes of

these changes are to be traced to the diversities of genius and education among christians, especially among the teachers, and to the peculiar circumstances and necessities of the church in different ages. The constitution of the church, the freedom of opinion, and the state of learning, have ever had great influence in shaping articles of faith.

Sec. 3. *Dogmatic History.*

The christian faith, like every other branch of knowledge, has both its *external* and its *internal* history. The former, which respects the mode of arranging and exhibiting articles of faith, is called the *History of Dogmatics;* the latter, which states the revolutions in the various articles of faith, is called *Dogmatic History.* Both, however, so run into each other, that it may be expedient to combine them. A dogmatic history may either embrace all ages and all articles of faith, or may be limited in one or both respects. Strict impartiality and truth, and a judicious selection and instructive development of facts, must ever be its first and most imperious laws.

Note. It is a question, whether dogmatic history should detail the doctrines inculcated by Christ and the Apostles, or confine itself to the received doctrines of the church.

Sec. 4. *Value of dogmatic history.*

The uses of dogmatic history are, that it is indispensable, to the attainment of a thorough knowledge and correct judgment of systematic theology; that it teaches us to distinguish the original christianity, from the subsequent spurious additions and corruptions; that it serves to awaken and animate a spirit of inquiry; that it promotes liberality, moderation, and independence; and that it warns us against the perversions of christianity in the past ages. It likewise affords the mind high intellectual pleasure, to contemplate in the mirror of history, the efforts and struggles of men after clearness and solidity of views on reli-

gious subjects; in which both the dependence and the the independence of the mind are clearly seen.

References. *J. A. Ernesti* Prolusio de Theologiæ historicæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate. Lips. 1759. 8vo. and in his Opuscul. Theol. ed. Lips. 1792. 8vo.

Lud. Wachleri, Prolusio de theologia et historia dogmatum emendanda. Rintel, 1794. 4to.

Chr. Fried. Illgen, The value of christian dogmatic history, (in German.) Lips. 1817. 8vo.

Sec. 5. *Sources.*

The sources, from which dogmatic history must be drawn, are not indeed equally copious and lucid in every period, yet they are considerably numerous and rich in all the periods. Among them, the public confessions of faith, the decrees and acts of ecclesiastical councils, the writings of persons in high authority in the church, and the public liturgies, hold the first rank; because they are public documents. Next to them, must be ranked the writings of the christian teachers in general, yet with discrimination, for all are not of equal authority; likewise the accounts of the credible historians, are important and useful.

Reference. *C. W. Fr. Walch's* critical Account of the Sources of church history; (in German,) Lips. 1770. 8vo. is applicable to dogmatic history.

Sec. 6. *Use to be made of these sources.*

To deduce history from these sources, requires extensive knowledge and great care. A discerning *criticism* must discriminate the spurious works from the genuine; and must correct the falsified and incorrect passages, which occur in works that are for the most part genuine. A good knowledge of *languages*, and dexterity in *interpreting*, must disclose the true meaning of different accounts. A sound *judgment* must, without partiality, estimate the value of all statements; exclude fables and groundless conjectures; and induce caution, not to infer

the opinions of a writer from insolated passages of his works, nor to bend his words to a conformity with our own system of belief; nor to confound the opinions of a particular writer, with the general creed of the church. Civil and ecclesiastical history, and the history of the sciences, particularly of philosophy, and even scientific theology itself, are necessary *auxiliaries* to the study of dogmatic history.

References. *J. Daillé*, de usu Patrum ad definienda religionis capita quæ hodie sunt controversa. I. II. Geneva, 1686. 4to. *Matth. Scrivener*, Apologia pro S. ecclesiæ Patribus adversus J. Dallaeum. Lond. 1672.

Sec. 7. *Literature of dogmatic history.*

In former times dogmatic history was either neglected, or occasionally touched upon, in treatises on theology and in ecclesiastical histories; but was used almost exclusively for polemical purposes. *John Solomon Semler* was the man, who especially awakened attention to its importance; and he wrote on some parts of it, with accumen and independence. Afterwards others labored to advance this branch of history.

LIST OF WORKS ON THE SUBJECT.

I. Works embracing the whole compass of dogmatic history; or commenced with that design.

A. *Works by Catholics.*

Dion. Petavii, Opus de theologicis dogmatibus. Paris, 1644—1650. V. tomi, Fol. with notes by *Theophilus Alethinus* (John le Clerc) Antw. (Amstel.) 1700. VI. tomi, Fol.

Dogmata theologica, authore *Ludov. Thomassino.* Paris, 1684—89. III. vol. Fol.

Doctrina et Disciplina ecclesiæ ex ipsis verbis sacrorum codicum, conciliorum, Patrum et veterum genuinorum monumentorum secundum seriem temporis digesta et exposita, studio et opera *R. P. Ludovici Dumesnil.* Tom. I. —IV. Colon. 1730, Fol.

B. *Works by Protestants.*

Io Forbesii a Corse, Instructiones historico-theologicæ de doctrina christiana. Amstel. 1702. *Arnoldi Montani*, Forbesius contractus, sive compendium Instructionum historico-theologicum—Forbesii. Amstel. 8vo.

Manual of christian dogmatic history, (in German,) by *W. Münscher*. Vol. I. and II. ed. 3d. Marpurg, 1817—18. vol. III. ed. 2d. ibid. 1818. vol. IV. ibid. 1809.

Elements of christian dogmatic history, (in German,) by *John Chr. Wil. Augusti*. Lips. 1805. 8vo.

Manual of christian dogmatic history, (Danish,) by *F. Münter*; (German,) by *J. P. G. Ewers*. II. vol. 8vo. Gottingen, 1802—04.

C. *Works by Unitarians.*

History of the corruptions of christianity, by *Joseph Priestley*, LL. D. 3d ed. Boston, 1797. II. vols. 12mo.

II. Works on the history of Dogmatics.

J. S. Semler's historical Introduction to theology; (in German,) prefixed to S. J. Baumgarten's evangelischer Glaubenslehre. Halle, 1759—60. III. vol. 4to.

Essay of a History of the various methods of teaching the articles of the christian faith, and of the most noticeable systems and compendiums of theology; (in German,) by *Ch. Gottl. Heinrich*. Lips. 1790.

Full instructions in the christian faith; (in German,) by *Ch. Fr. Ammon*. I. vol. in 2 parts. Nuremb. and Altorf. 1808.

III. Ecclesiastical Histories, which are most valuable for dogmatic history.

Ecclesiastica Historia per aliquot pios et studiosos viros in urbe Magdeburgica, Bas. 1559—74. XIII. Tomi. Fol.

Caes. Baronii, Annales Ecclesiastici. Romæ 1588—1607. XII. vol. Fol. *Odorici Raynaldi*, Annales Eccles. Rom. 1646—76. X. vol. Fol. Both together, Lucca, 1738—1759. XXXVIII. vol. Fol.

Natalis Alexandri, Historia Ecclesiastica; Paris 1776—86. XXVI. vol. 8vo. Venet, 1778. XI. vol. Fol.

James Basnage, History of the Church; (in French,) 1699. II. Vol. Fol.

Jo. Matth. Schroeckh, Christian church History; (in German,) 1768—1810. XLV. vol. 8vo.

J. E. Ch. Schimdt, Manual of christian church History; (in German; to the Reformation,) VI. vol. 8vo. Giessen and Darmst. 1801—20.

A. Neander, General history of the christian religion and church; (in German,) 1825. IV. vol. 8vo. to be continued.

IV. Systems of Theology, which contain something of dogmatic history.

J Gerhardi, Loci theologici—denuo edidit J. Fried. Cotta. Tubing. 1762—89. XXII. vol. 4to.

G. F. Seileri, Theologia dogmatico-polemica, cum compendio histor. dogmat. 3d. ed. Erl. 1789. 8vo.

I. F. Gruner, Institutionum theologiæ dogmaticæ, I—III. Hallae, 1777. 8vo.

I. Christopher Doederlein, Institutio theologi christiani in capitibus religionis theoreticis; ed. 6, Altorf. 1799. II. vols. 8vo.

Elements of theology and of dogmatical history; (in German,) by *C. Fr. Stäudlin*, 3d ed. 1809. 8vo.

Commentarii historici decretorum religionis christianæ et formulæ Lutheriæ, scripsit *Christ. Dan. Beck.* Lips. 1801. 8vo.

I. A. L. Wegscheider, Institutiones theol. christ. dogmataticæ, addita singulorum dogmatum historia et censura; ed. 2, Hallae, 1817. 8vo.

Sec. 8. *Method in dogmatic history.*

Since it has been admitted, that dogmatic history is not to be regarded as a mere *appendage* to church history or to dogmatic theology, but that it deserves to be treated independently; different methods for its execution have been proposed, and some of them have been put in practice. Some writers prefer a mere chronological arrangement; others a classification of the materials; and others again would combine both. The objects of an elementary history may perhaps be best secured, by as-

suming certain long periods of time; and by giving, first a general view of the state of theology, and then a historical account of the principal doctrines held in each period. It appears not unsuitable, to make three periods: I. The early ages, A. D. 1—600. II. The middle ages, A. D. 600—1517. III. Modern times, A. D. 1517—down to the present day.

Remark. On method in dogmatic history, see *J. Chr. W. Augusti* neuen theol. Blättern, vol. II. P. II. p. 11—22. *W. M. L. de Wette* über Religion und Theologie. Berlin, 1815, 8vo. P. II. cap. iv. von der Christlichen Dogmengeschichte, p. 167—193.

FIRST PERIOD.

THE EARLY AGES. A. D. 1—600.

Works. J. S. Semler's historical Introduction, (in German,) prefixed to S. J. Baumgarten's Untersuchungen theologischer Streitigkeiten. Halle, 1762–64. III. vol. 4to.

Doctrinal belief of the christian church in the three first centuries; (in German, by *Ch. Fr. Rösler.*) Frankf. 1775. 8vo. *Rösler's* Library of the Fathers, in translations and abridgments; (in German,) Lips, 1776–86. X. vol. 8vo. *G. D. Fuch's* Library of the ecclesiastical Councils; (in German,) Lips, 1780–84. IV. vol. 8vo.

Essays on the dogmatic history of the ancient Greek church, to the time of Clemens Alexandrinus; (in German, by *J. Fr. Gaab.*) Jena, 1790. 8vo.

A full history of doctrines, as held by the Fathers; (in German,) by *Sam. Gottl. Lange.* 1 vol. Lips, 1796.

History of the faith of Christians, from the age of Athanasius, to Gregory the Great; (in German,) by *J. Chr. Fr. Wundemann.* Lips, 1798–99. II. vol. 8vo.

Antiquity of ecclesiastical doctrines; (in German,) by *J. Ullr. Röder.* Coburg, 1812. 8vo.

PART I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE STATE OF THEOLOGY.

Sec. 9. *Jesus Christ.*

The Jewish nation was distinguished from the surrounding nations, by giving homage to the one God, in accordance with their sacred books; with a splendid worship and numerous ceremonies. As the original character of the Mosaic religion was disfigured by speculations, by narrow conceptions, and immoral practices, Jesus Christ appeared, as one sent from God, for the purpose of estab-

lishing *a kingdom of God* on the earth. His doctrine was simple and practical, and was exhibited as occasions drew it forth. Yet in compass and extent, it far surpassed the Jewish; and it embraced the superlative germs of truth, for the profounder reflection and investigations of the succeeding ages.

Reference. *Fr. V. Reinhard* on the plan which the founder of the christian religion devised, for the benefit of mankind; (in German,) 4th ed. 1798.

Sec. 10. *The Apostles.*

The apostles, who continued to propagate and spread the doctrines of Christ, and who were led by their circumstances to explain those doctrines more fully, compensated for their lack of a learned education by their deep feeling, their noble spirit, and their devout sense of religion. Notwithstanding it has been questioned, whether they all, with equal success, penetrated into the *whole* system of their master's doctrine, yet it is certain that the *Spirit* of Jesus animated them all. Paul, who was one of them, and the most active among them, employed his Jewish learning in explaining and enforcing christianity.*

Sec. 11. *Opinions of the early Christians.*

The views and the convictions of such as united with the christians, in the earliest times, could not but be exceedingly various and unlike; for they had differed extremely in religion, in education, in habits, and other circumstances; and it must have been a considerable time, before the community could annihilate, or even diminish greatly, the peculiarities of individuals. *Here*, labored zealous teachers, (the apostolic fathers,) in the true spirit

* Had the translator felt himself at liberty to express his own views, he would in this section have given far more distinctness and prominence to those *miraculous gifts*, or that *divine inspiration*, which Christ promised to his disciples, to qualify them for their office. But such liberty was not allowable in a translation: and the translator begs leave to remind the reader, that the private opinions and theological hypotheses, occasionally appearing among the historical facts in different parts of the work, are always those of the *author*, who alone is responsible for them.

of the apostles, though with diminished power. *There*, other christians formed a closer union with Judaism. And a *third* class, (the Gnostics,) wishing to separate christianity altogether from Judaism, shaped it according to their own speculations.

Sec. 12. *The Church and its Creed.*

The disorders arising from this diversity of views, and which tended to the prostration of the christian cause, might contribute, at least, to induce various churches to unite together, and to acknowledge none as true christians, who did not embrace a definite but simple creed. A belief in the Father, as the Creator of the world; in the Son, who became a man and died for the salvation of men; in the Holy Ghost, who guided the ancient prophets, as well as the apostles; joined with the expectation of a future judgment and divine retribution; were the chief articles of this creed, which was propagated by oral instruction. Yet with it, the holy scriptures of the Old Testament, were used; and gradually also, the writings of the apostles and the apostolical Fathers.

Note. A Creed is given by *Irenæus*, adv. Haeres. L. I. c. 10. by *Tertullian*, de Velandis Virgin. c. 1. de Praescript. Haeres. c. 13. contra Prax. c. 2. and by *Origin*, de Princip. Prefatio. (*Schütz*) Progr. de Regula fidei apud Tertullianum; Jenae, 1781. 4to.

Sec. 13. *The received Theology.*

About the middle of the second century, various persons joined the christian community, who were no strangers to Grecian learning and science. They needed and employed this knowledge and their intellectual vigor, in the various conflicts in which the church was involved. Pagans and Jews slandered christianity; and writers appeared against it. These were answered by apologies. The sects which were excluded from the churches, sought revenge; and they framed bold systems of belief. Within the church, the seeds of new controversies sprung up. Thus occasion was afforded for apologies, and for controversial writings; and new statements and expositions

of the christian doctrines were introduced, in which the Bible and tradition were used as the sources of knowledge, and philosophy employed as an auxiliary.

Reference. *Jno. G. Rosenmüller*, de christianae theologiae origine liber. Lips, 1786. 8vo.

Sec. 14. *Estimation of the Bible.*

The Old Testament was received, as a divine revelation, by the general church, but not by the *Gnostics* and *Manichaeans*. Yet some esteemed only the books written in Hebrew as divine, while others included those also which were found in Greek. By the Manichaeans, the books of the New Testament were not regarded as the genuine productions of the apostles; and previously, *Marcion* had denied the authority of all the apostles except Paul, and had used only one gospel and two epistles of Paul. The Catholics, from the middle of the second century, received with one voice the four gospels, the book of Acts, the Pauline epistles, and the first epistles of Peter and John; but they held different opinions respecting the other books. Divine inspiration was predicated, equally, of the Old and New Testaments, and no person was prohibited from reading either.

References. (*Corodi,*) Essay for elucidating the History of the Jewish and Christian biblical Canons; (in German,) Halle, 1792. II. vol. 8vo. Contributions to the History of the New Testament Canon; (in German,) by *Chr. Fried. Weber;* Tubing. 1791. Critical History of the New Testament Scriptures; (in German,) by *J. E. Chr. Schmidt;* Giessen, 1804. II. vol. 8vo. *Chr. W. Fr. Walch,* Critical investigation of the use made of the Holy Scriptures in the four first centuries; (in German,) Lips. 1779. 8vo. Compare *G. E. Lessing's* Theological Remains; (in German,) Berlin, 1784. 8vo.

Sec. 15. *Use of the Bible.*

The teachers, with the exception only of Origen and Jerome, depended entirely on the Greek and Latin translations of the Old Testament. And, in the New Testament, many Latins followed solely their version. The

interpretation of the Bible was not based on sound principles, and run much into allegorical meanings. The theory of interpretation proposed by *Origen*, was not indeed embraced in all its parts by the succeeding fathers, yet was often partially adopted. The pure grammatical expositions, attempted in the East, by *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, after the fourth century, met with little encouragement. *John Chrysostom*, following the laxer principles of the Antiochean school, met with more approbation. The occasional disagreements, between the received doctrines and the Bible, were adjusted by recurrence to the principle of *accommodation*, supposed to be adopted by the writers of the Bible; yet *Irenaeus* and *Augustine* declared against it.

Reference. *J. G. Rosenmülleri*, Historia interpretationis librorum sacrorum in ecclesia christiana; in V. Parts. Hildburgh. 1795—1807. Lips. 1813–14. 8vo.

Fr. A. Carus, Historia antiquior sententiarum ecclsiae graecae, de accommodatione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributa. Lips. 1793. 4to.

Sec. 16. *Tradition.*

Tradition was at first the primary, and afterwards continued to be the secondary, source of a knowledge of christianity. On tradition was founded the decision respecting the Canon of the Bible. It was resorted to, as a rule for interpreting the scriptures, and as a means of ascertaining the doctrines of christianity, and for the confutation of opposers. The decisions of ecclesiastical councils, and the writings of eminent divines, continually widened the compass and extent of traditional knowledge. A way was also devised, for removing or concealing the difficulties, which attended the use of tradition, arising from the contradictory opinions advanced by the older fathers. *Vincentius* of Lirins gave a system of rules, to be used in appealing to tradition. Besides the public traditions of the church, the Gnostics, and likewise some Catholic fathers, as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, made pretensions to private traditions, which were preserved by the apostles and their confidential disciples.

Reference. *H. P. Marheinecke*, on the meaning of *Tradition* in the Catholic System; (in German,) in *Daub* u. *Creutzer's* Studien. vol. IV. 2. p. 320. &c.

Sec. 17. *Philosophy.*

Some Gnostics had previously mixed up philosophical speculations with christianity; but it was past the middle of the second century, when the catholic fathers began to make use of philosophy. However hazardous it was, in the view of *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*, to combine philosophy with christianity; in the view of the Alexandrian fathers, it was deemed necessary and salutary. They were, indeed, far from preferring Grecian philosophy to the declarations of Jesus Christ; and likewise from paying absolute homage to any philosophical sect whatever, though they valued Plato above all the other philosophers; but they used philosophy as an *auxiliary*, to elucidate and confirm the christian doctrines, and to impress their truth upon the educated Pagans. And there continued to be, afterwards, different opinions respecting the utility of philosophy; which, however, had less and less influence on the articles of christian faith, as the tenets of the general church became more definitely fixed.

References. *J. A. G. Neander*, de fidei gnoseosque idea, et ea, qua ad se invicim et ad philosophiam referantur, ratione secundum Clementem Alexand. Heidelb, 1811. 8vo.

Le Platonisme devoilé (par *Souverain*,) à Cologne 1700, 8vo.—and in German, by *J. F. Löffler*, ed. 2. Züllich. 1792. 8vo.

(*Baltus*,) Defense de Saints Peres accusés du Platonisme. Paris, 1711. 4to.

Laur Mosheim, Diss. de turbata per recentiores Platonicos ecclesia; in his Dissertt. ad Historiam eccles. vol. I. ed. 1743.

Histoire critique de l' électicisme, ou des nouveaux Platoniciens. Paris, 1766. 2 vols. 12mo.

C. A. Theoph. Keil, de doctoribus ecclesiae culpa corruptae

per Platonicas sententias Theologiae liberandis ; Commentatt. I—XIV. Lips. 1793, &c.

History of Philosophy ; (in German,) by *W. Gottl. Tennemann.* 7th vol. Lips. 1809.

Sec. 18. *Character of the Theologians.*

From the sources and auxiliaries now described, theological systems were framed. The Asiatic teachers, as *Irenaeus*, kept nearer to the apostolical simplicity. The African, *Tertullian*, distinguished himself by a more gloomy strictness, and by a glowing imagination. The Alexandrians, among whom *Clement* was prominent, shewed more freedom of thought, and a more metaphysical disposition, and made a distinction between the popular belief and scientific investigations, (πιστις and γνωσις.)

[*References.* *A. Neander*, General History of the Christian religion and church : (in German.) vol. I. P. III. p. 861—957, ed. Hamb. 1827.]

Idea of the perfectability of Christianity, entertained by the *Gnostics* and the *Manichaeans*, by the *Montanists*, by *Origen* and *Vincent* of Lirins.

Sol. Deyling, Irenaeus evangelicae veritatis confessor et testis :—in his Observatt. miscellaneis. p. 3.—*J. G. Walch*, de Clemente Alexandrino et ejus erroribus ; in his Miscell. sacris. p. 510.

Sec. 19. *Origen.*

In the Alexandrian school arose *Origen*, who excelled all the other teachers in learning and untiring activity. He not only defended christianity against *Celsus*, but, in his work de Principiis (περι αρχων,) made the first attempt to philosophise on christian doctrines in their connections. His chief object was, to shew that the wisdom and goodness of the divine govenment were in harmony with the freedom of man's will. The many peculiar ideas and hypotheses which he advanced, are worthy of attention, although not received into the prevailing system of belief. Even in his life time, and still more after

his death, he was held in very different estimation. Far less was the influence of the Latin fathers, *Cyprian*, *Novatian*, *Arnobius*, and *Latantius*, in perfecting systematic theology.

Reference. *P. Dan. Huet.* Origeniana :—in Origen's Works, ed. *de la Rue.* tom. IV.

Sec. 20. *Christianity, as the prevailing Religion.*

Soon after the commencement of the fourth century, a great change took place, when the Roman Emperors professed themselves Christians; and the consequences in regard to theology, were extensive and important. Now, the court concerned itself with points of faith among christians. Now, theological controversies were decided and creeds established, by general councils. Now, certain distinguished bishops in the principal sees, had the chief concern in defining the articles of faith. The rapid spread of monkery, infused its spirit into the theologians. The prevailing belief was still defended by arguments from the Bible and from tradition; but strict orthodoxy was esteemed of higher importance; and a mysterious efficacy was more and more ascribed to religious rites and usages. Freedom of inquiry was cramped; and deceptive reasoning was sometimes allowed of in theology.

Sec. 21. *Religious controversies.*

The religious controversies, which were carried on with the greatest vehemence, contributed very much, to shape the system of theology. There was controversy with the *Manichaeans*, respecting the origin of evil, and respecting divine providence; and with the *Donatists*, respecting the true notion of a church. The *Arian* contest procured for *Athanasius*, the reputation of being the father of orthodoxy, and afforded *Basil* of Cesarea, *Hilary* of Poictiers, and the two *Gregorys*, an opportunity to display *their* talents. The *Pelagian* contest put in requisition the unceasing activity of *Augustine*. The

protracted quarrel respecting the person of Christ, the seeds of which were sowed in the fourth century, but attained maturity in the fifth, attracted general attention; though *Cyril* of Alexandria, *Theodoret* and *Leo* the Great, were the most prominent in it; as *Facundus*, Bp. of Hermiane, was in the dispute concerning the Three Chapters. The Romish Bishop, *Gregory* the great, closes the list of distinguished fathers in this period.

Sec. 22. *System of Theology.*

While some controverted points of doctrine were examined with diligence, very little was done for advancing the general system of theology. Some efforts for a popular exhibition of it, were made by *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Rufinus*, *Theodoret*, and *Gennadius*. The more full religious instruction by *Gregory* of Nyssa, was intended for the use of the learned. An abundance of materials for an occidental system of theology, was prepared by *Augustine;* who brought into circulation many new views, to which his influence gave currency.

References. Sol. Deyling, Cyrillus Hierosol. a corruptelis Pontificiorum purgatus; in his Observatt. Miscell. p. 116.—(*Engelstofft,*) Hieronymus Stridoniensis, interpres, criticus, exegeta, &c. Hafniae, 1797. 8vo.

Sec. 23. *Decline of theological learning.*

After the middle of the fifth century, theological learning depreciated. There were no seminaries, for the education of religious teachers. A disposition to make investigation, gave place to a servile repetition of what had been said by others; and compilations appeared, instead of original works. Ignorance and superstition got the upper hand; and a tenacious adherence to the decisions of ecclesiastical councils and of the eminent fathers, characterized the theologians. *Junilius* sketched the plan of a system; and the spurious writings of *Dyonisius* the Areopagite, encouraged the inclination to superstitious creations of the imagination.

References. *Junilius,* de Partibus legis divinae Lib. II.—*Jo. Dailè,* de Scriptis, quae sub Dyonisii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antioch. nomine circumferunter. Genev. 1666. 4to.

PART II.

HISTORY OF PARTICULAR DOCTRINES.

CHAPTER I.

DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

Sec. 24. *Origin of the Idea.*

The Jewish nation expected a kingdom, to be established by the Messiah; and this idea Jesus did not reject, but only elevated and improved it. The christians were distinguished from the Jews, by considering the Messiah as already come, and by their anticipation of his second coming in glory. The approaching kingdom of the Messiah was, by most christians, described with sensible imagery, after the Jewish manner. Thus was formed the doctrine of Chiliasm; which was embraced by the heretic *Cerinthus,*(1) as well as by the Bp. *Papias.*(2.)

(1) *Euseb.* H. E. III. c. 28. *Theodoret,* Haeret. II. c. 3.
(2) *Irenaeus.* adv. Haeres. V. c. 33, and *Euseb.* H. E. III. c. 39.

Reference. De regno Christi in N. T. formulis βασιλειας Θεϱ, &c. expresso; Excursus II. in the Koppian N. Test. on Ep. to the Thess.—*C. A. Th. Keil,* Historia dogmatis de regno Messiae, Christi et Apostolorum aetate; Lips. 1781, 4to.—*I. C. Rud. Eckermann's* Theological contributions: (in German,) vol. II. P. I. p. 67.—*C. Chr. Flatt,* Diss. de notione vocis βασιλεια των ὐρανων. Tubing. 1794, 4to.

W. Münscher, Historical account of the doctrine of a thousand years reign, as held in the three first centuries; (in

German,) in Henke's Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, u. s. w. vol. VI. P. II. p. 233 &c.—(*Corodi.*) Critical history of Chiliasm; (in German,) ed. 2. 1794, IV. vol. 8vo.

Sec. 25. *Friends and opposers of Chiliasm.*

The Gnostics (1) were decided opposers of the thousand years reign: yet in the second century, the doctrine came near to being accounted a part of the orthodox faith, and was defended by the most reputable fathers, as *Justin Martyr* (2), *Irenaeus* (3), and *Tertullian* (4). The *Montanists*, appear to have been much attached to this doctrine. On the contrary, it met with opposition from some Catholics, particularly those of Alexandria; and *Origen*(5) labored with great zeal, to banish from the church an opinion, which he deemed to be Jewish and degrading to christianity.

(1) *Münscher's* Manual of dogmatic history, vol. II. Sec. 272. *Walch's* History of Heresies, vol. I. p. 515.
(2) Dial. cum Tryph. p. 177, 178, 202, 203.
(3) adv. Haeres. V. 25—36.
(4) contra Marcion. III. c. 24.
(5) Proleg. in Cantic. Opp. T. III. p. 26. de Princip. L. II. c. 11. Opp. T. I. p. 104—in Psalm. Opp. II. p. 570—in Matth. Opp. III. p. 827. contra Cels. IV. Opp. I. p. 516.

Sec. 26. *Last struggles of Chiliasm.*

Notwithstanding the efforts of Origen, Chiliasm continued to find advocates. *Methodius* (1) and *Hippolytus* (2) were its patrons; and the Egyptian Bishop, *Nepos*, (3) undertook to confute the arguments of Origen. But *Dionysius* of Alexandria (4) espoused the side of Origen, and he brought the Chiliasts, and their champion *Coracion*, to renounce it. From that time, the reigning propensity to this doctrine declined; especially, as the relations of the church to the Roman government became changed. Yet the doctrine was held by individuals, so late as the fourth century; among whom were *Lactantius* (5) *Apollinaris*, (6) and various western chris-

tians (7.) Even *Augustine*, (8) at first, admitted a thousand years reign of Christ, though a spiritual one: but he afterwards gave up that idea.

(1) Sympos. X. Virgin. p. 129.
(2) See *Photius*, Bibloth. cod.202. p. 525.
(3) *Euseb.* H. E. VII. c. 24.
(4) *Euseb.* l. c.
(5) Institt. divin. L. VII. c. 14—25.
(6) *Epiphan.* Haeres. LXXVII. Sec. 26.
(7) *Jerome*, Prooem. in Lib. XVII. Jesaiae, Opp. Tom. V. p. 203 &c.
(8) Sermo CLIX. Opp. Tom. V. p. 1060. de Civitate Dei. XX. c. 7. Retract. I. c. 17.

Sec. 27. *Doctrine of the Resurrection.*

Sources of the history of it.—Besides occasional notices; see *Justin Martyr*, Ἀποδειξις resurrectionis carnis.—*Athenagoras*, de Resurrectione Liber.—*Tertullian*, de Resurrectione carnis.—*Origen*, de Principiis L. II. c. 10.—*Cyril* of Jerusalem, Catech. XVIII.—*Gregory Nyssen*, de Anima et Resurrectione.—*Ambrose*, de Fide resurrectionis.—*Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, L. XXII.

Histories of the doctrine. Fides dogmatis de Resurrectione carnis per IV. priora secula. Enarratio historico-critica; by *W. Alb. Teller*, Halle and Helmst, 1766. 8vo. History of opinions, concerning the state of man after death, in the christian church; (in German,) by *Ch. W. Flügge*, Lips. 1799—1800. II. vols. 8vo.

This doctrine was closely connected with that of Chiliasm; and with it, passed from the Jews to the Christians. Those who suffered death under persecution, before the full establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, were not to be excluded from its blessedness. The Messiah, it was supposed, would recall them to life again. *Jesus* himself taught a resurrection of the dead; and *Paul* advanced a beautiful theory concerning it. But the *Chiliasts* maintained the restoration of the former bodies of men, with all their parts and members; and endeavored to make this to be conceivable. *Justin Mar-*

tyr and *Tertullian* composed their treatises on the resurrection, with these views.

Sec. 28. *Opposition to this grosser theory.*

The *Gnostics* could not admit, at all, the doctrine of a resurrection; because it contravened one of their fundamental principles, that of the incurable malignancy of matter. They, of course, anticipated rewards and punishments only for the soul. The Alexandrians, *Clemens*(1) and *Origen*, (2) adhered indeed to the prevailing doctrine of a resurrection of the body; but they discarded the idea, that the entire human body, with all its parts and members, would be restored to its former condition; and maintained, that God would bestow on men more refined bodies, better suited to their elevated state. In this they were influenced by the Platonic notions, that the body is a shackle to the soul,(3) and that human souls existed before the creation of this material world.

(1) Paedag. II. c. 10. and III. c. 1, 4.
(2) de Princip. Prooem. Sec. 5. p. 48.—contra Cels. V. 590 594 &c. and Lib. VIII. p. 777 &c. and Lib. II. c. 2, 3, 10.
(3) *Clemens Alex.* Strom. IV. p. 569.

Sec. 29. *Subsequent history of the doctrine.*

The opinions of the Gnostics was again advanced by the *Manicheans*;(1) but was absolutely rejected by the church. On the other hand, the grosser theory, (which however was detached from its connexion with Chiliasm,) and the more refined theory of *Origen*, both held their place in the church, for a long time;(2) until, *Epiphanius*(3) and *Jerome*,(4) in their controversy with *John* bishop of Jerusalem and *Rufinus*, pressed closely the letter of the creed, that the same bodies with all their former parts and members, would be raised again. Even *Augustine*(5) finally declared himself of this opinion; and the opposite opinion sunk more and more into disrepute, till at length the Emperor *Justinian*(6) proscribed it. Yet subsequently, all disagreements in the explanation of the doctrine were not entirely at an end.(7)

(1) *Theodoret.* Epit. Haer. Lib. I. c. 26.
(2) *Münscher's* Handbu. vol. IV. p. 438 &c.
(3) Ancor. § 89—102. Haeres LIV. § 63 &c.
(4) Adv. errores Joannis Hieros. ad Pammach. Opp. Tom. II. p. 118, &c. Epitaph. Paulae, ad Eustoch. Opp. Tom. I. p. 117. Apol. contra Rufin. L. II. Opp. II. p. 145.
(5) Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 85, 87, 89—91. de Civitate Dei. XXII. c. 13—21.
(6) *Mansi*, Concil. Tom. IX. p. 400, 516.
(7) *Münscher*, l. c. p. 449 &c.

Sec. 30. *The intermediate state.*

The inquiries respecting the resurrection, and the commencement of the future retributions, unavoidably brought up the question, What is the state of the soul, when it is separate from the body? In answering it, the early fathers combined the old notion of a region of shades, with the doctrine of recompense after death. All souls, said they, pass immediately, after death, into the lower world; where the good, severed from the others, enjoy a foretaste of blessedness, and the bad have a foretaste of punishment; until the time of full retribution, after the resurrection. Yet the souls of martyrs, have the privilege of going, immediately after death, to heavenly bliss. The place of residence for good souls, that died after Christ's day, was different from *Abraham's bosom*, or the residence of the souls that died before Christ,—out of which, however, Christ had removed them.

Reference. Irenaeus. adv. Haeres. II. c. 34. V. c. 5, 31. *Justin Martyr*, Dial. p. 107, 178, 200. *Tertullian*, de Anima. c. 7, 43, 55, 58. de Resurrect. c. 17, 43. Apologet. c. 47. de Monog. c. 10, contra Marcion. IV. c. 34. *Origen*, Opp. Tom. I. p. 35, 106, 213, 434, 696 &c. Tom. II. p. 222, 372, 496 &c. *Hippolytus*, Opp. ed Fabric. Tom I. p. 220.

Treatise on the belief of the Fathers respecting the state of souls after the present life: (in French,) by *Dav. Blondel.* Charenton, 1651. 4to.

S. I. Baumgarten, Historia doctrinae de statu animarum separatarum ; Halle, 1754. 4to.

Jo. Aug. Dietelmair, Historia dogmatis de descensu Christi ad inferos. ed. 2. 1768. 8vo.

J. S. Semler, Observatio historico-dogmatica, de vario et impari studio veterum in recolenda Historia descensus Christi ad inferos ; Hal. 1775. 4to.

Dogmatis de descensu I. C. ad inferos Historiam biblicam atque ecclesiasticam, composuit *I. Clausen*. Hafn. 1801. 8vo

Sec. 31. *Subsequent modifications.*

As martyrdoms became less frequent, the privilege of immediate admission to the world of glory, was extended beyond the class of martyrs, to persons of distinguished piety, particularly to ascetics and monks. And now, *Augustine*(1) fell upon the idea, that the place of other souls, which were destined to glory, but were not quite fit for it at leaving the body, was a place of *purgation*. As preparing the way for this idea, it had been customary, from the earliest times, to pray for the souls of the dead ;(2) and various early fathers had mentioned a purifying fire; which, however, they placed in the process of the general judgment, or subsequent to it.(3)

(1) de Civitate Dei. XXI. c. 13, 24, 26. contra Julian. VI. c. 15. § 45, and Opp. Tom VI. p. 127, 128, 180, 181.

(2) *Tertull.* de Monog. c. 10. contra Marcion. III. c. 24. *Epiphan.* Haeres. LXXV. § 3, 7. *Cyril.* Hieros. Catech. XXIII. § 9, 10. *Chrysost.* in Ep. ad Philip. Homil. III.—in Ep. I. ad Cor. Homil. XLI.

(3) *Methodius*; in Photius, Biblioth. Cod. 234, p. 923. *Lactantius*. Instit. div. VII. c. 21.

Sec. 32. *Purgatory fully established.*

The theory advanced without assurance by *Augustine*, was held up as certain, by *Caesarius*(1) of Arles, and *Gregory*(2) the Great. According to them, the souls which had been guilty of venial sins, but had not done adequate penance for them in this life, would suffer, according to the degree of their guilt, a longer or shorter time, after

death, in a fire of purgation; and then would pass into the place of the blessed. The anguish of these souls, moreover, may be mitigated, or curtailed, by the prayers and the good works of the living.

(1) Homil. VIII. extant in the Biblioth. max. Patr. Tom. VIII. p. 826–28. and in Opp. Augustini, Tom. V. Append. Serm. CIV. p. 185.
(2) Dialog. Lib. IV. c. 39, 40, 55.

Sec. 33. *Hell.*

Hell, (Gehenna,) or the place of the damned, was totally distinct from the fire of purgatory. On the duration of hell-torments, there was not perfect uniformity of sentiment. Some, as *Arnobius*,(1) and perhaps *Justin Martyr*, supposed the punishment would end, in the annihilation of those who suffered it. *Origen*(2) allowed to the damned a hope of their reformation and salvation; and this idea is seen to glimmer, even in the corrupt translation of his writings by *Rufinus*. The similar views of *Gregory*(3) of Nyssa, in many of his declarations, cannot be construed away. Also the Antiochian fathers, *Diodorus*(4) of Tarsus, and *Theodore*(5) of Mopsuestia, believed in the termination of future punishment. *Jerome* insisted, indeed, on the eternal punishment of all who rejected christianity; but he allowed wicked *christians* to hope for a release. By far the greater part of the fathers, however, declared themselves believers in the *eternity* of the torments of *all* the wicked;(6) and the zeal of the Emperor *Justinian* caused the ideas of *Origen* on this subject, to be anathematized.(7)

(1) adv. Gentes. Lib. II. p. 52, 86.
(2) de Princip. L.II. c. 3, 5, 6,10. Lib. III. c. 6, 8, and Opp. Tom. I. p. 231. Tom. II. p. 113, 115, 230. Tom. III. p. 667. Yet he would conceal this doctrine from the people, as being corrupting: contra Cels. L.III. p.499. L.VI. p. 650. L.V. p. 598, 599. and Opp. Tom. II. p. 686, 889. Tom. III. p. 267.
(3) Orat. catech. c. 8, 26, 35.

(4 and 5) See *Assemann*, Biblioth. Orient. T. III. P. I. p. 323, 324.

(6) *Justin Martyr*, Apol. II. p. 48, 60, 74. Dial. p. 141,223. *Tatian*, Orat. ad Graec. p. 254 &c. *Theoph.* ad Autol. p. 346. *Irenaeus*, adv. Haer. V. c. 27. *Tertullian*, Apologet. c. 48. de Resurr. carnis c. 35. de Testimonio Anim. c. 4. *Minucius Felix*, Octav. c. 35. *Cyprian*, ad Demetr. p. 196. *Lactantius*, Instit. div. VII. c. 21, 26. *Basil* the Great, Opp. Tom. II. p. 507. Tom. III. p. 553. *Cyril* of Jerus. Cat. IV. § 30. XVIII. § 19. *Hilary* of Poictiers, Comment. in Matth. c. V. § 12. p. 635. *Chrysostom*, ad Theodor. lapsum. I. c. 6. Opp. T. IV. p. 559. *Augustine*, in many places; e. g. Enchir. ad Laur. c. 111, 112. de Civitate Dei. XXI. passim. *Pelagius*, Symbol. in Walchii Bibl. symbol. p. 195. *Cyril* of Alexand. de Exitu animae &c. Opp. Tom. V. P. II. p. 409. *Theodoret*, in Isai. Opp. T. II. p. 396. *Gennadius*, de dogmat. eccles. c. 9. *Fulgentius* of Ruspe, de Remiss. peccat. L. II. c. 13 &c. *Cassiodorus*, de Anima. c. 12. *Gregory* the Gr. Moral. IX. c. 38, Dialog. IV. c. 44.

(7) *Mansi* Concil. IX. p. 399, 518.

References. *I. A. Dietelmaier*, Commenti fanatici ἀποκαταστάσεως παντων Historia antiquior. Altorf. 1769, 8vo.

J. Fr. Cotta. Historia succincta dogmatis de poenarum infernalium duratione. Tubing. 1774.

Hos. Ballou. (History of the doctrine of universal salvation:) Boston, 1827. 12mo.

Sec. 34. *Doctrine concerning the Church.*

With the doctrine of the glorious kingdom of Christ, and the rewards and punishments there to be expected, the early christians connected the doctrine of *the church*, as being the present kingdom of Christ, and the institution which was preparatory to the future state of glory. Though the society of christians was spoken of by Jesus, as being *one*; yet this unity had reference solely to a *moral* oneness. Moreover, the first christian communities were bound together, only by their feelings of brotherly love, and by their acts of kindness. *Ignatius*, however, pressed upon christians, to adhere closely to their respective Bishops.

Sec. 35. *Unity of the general Church.*

Before the end of the second century, the idea of *one church*, as an establishment of the apostles, spread over the whole world, and harmonizing in doctrine, was formed. *Irenaeus*, the first that expressed this idea, connected with it the thoughts, that only in this catholic church can the truth be found, and that all separations from it are reprehensible. By the African doctors, *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, these thoughts were widely propagated; and in the fourth century, the belief in one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, was made an article of the public creed.

Reference. *Cyprian*, de Unitate ecclesiae Liber.

Sec. 36. *Controversies respecting the marks of a true church.*

The Novatians declared their community to be, the only true church; because all others had become corrupt, by receiving the lapsed to fellowship. The same assumption was made by the *Donatists;* yet with this difference, in the ground of it, that the other churches were contaminated, by their communing with *Traditors.* And hence, *Augustine* took occasion, to represent *catholicism* as the sign of a true church; so that purity in all its members, was not requisite. His views were generally embraced. The Romish bishops began early, to seize upon the idea, that it belonged to *them* to be the head of the general church.

References. *Optatus* Milevit. de Schismate Donatistarum, L. VIII. ed. L. E. Du Pin. Paris, 1701. *Augustine*, contra Parmenianum Donatist. L. III.—contra Literas Petiliani, L. iii.—de Unitate ecclesiae, L. I.—contra Cresconium Donat. L. IV.—contra Gaudentium Donat. L. II.

CHAPTER II.

DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANGELS, AND DEVILS.

Histories of it. *Jac. Ode*, Tractatus de Angelis; Traj. ad Rhen. 1739. 4to. *J. Fr. Cotta*, Diss. II. succinctam doctrinæ de Angelis historiam exhibentes: Tubing. 1765. 4to.

Sec. 37. *Existence of Angels.*

With the belief of an approaching glorious kingdom of the Messiah, the Christians had also a belief of a powerful, but invisible kingdom of spirits, which had a constant influence on the earth and on the state of men; and this belief, which they derived from the Jewish theology, was to them of great importance, and very efficient in kindling religious feelings. The angels were considered as beings, who derived their origin from God, (though the time and manner of their origin were differently represented,) who ranked above men, yet were not absolutely uncorporeal; and who were divided into two classes, good and bad angels.

Reference. *Justin Martyr*, Apol. maj. Sec. 6, p. 47. Ἐκεινον τε (τον ἀληθεσατον Θεον και πατερα) και τον παρ' ἀυτε ὑιον ἐλθοντα και διδαξαντα ἡμας ταυτα, και τον των ἀλλων ἑπομενων και ἐξομοιεμενων ἀγαθων ἀγγελων κρατον, πνευμα τε το προφητικον σεβομεθα και προσκυνεμεν λογῳ και ἀληθεια τιμωντες. This passage is capable, indeed, of different interpretations; yet in any way, it shows the high importance then attached to the doctrine concerning angels.

Sec. 38. *Offices of the Angels.*

The *Gnostics* ascribed to angels, the creation of the material world, the enactment of the Jewish law, and the inspiration of the ancient prophets. And the other christians were persuaded that God, in governing the world, used the instrumentality of angels. An angel was as-

signed to each nation, as its overseer; and to each person, one or two guardian angels were appointed. This last hypothesis was first published by *Hermas*, in his Shepherd.(1)

(1) *Hermas*, Pastor, Mandat. VI.
Reference. *F. Schmidt*, Historia dogmatis de Angelis tutelaribus, P. I. in the memoirs of the Historico-theological Society of Leipsic, edited by Illgen, Lips. 1818. p. 24—71.

Sec. 39. *Condition of the Angels.*

The opinion of *Origen*, that even the good angels were not faultless, and beyond the danger of sinning, was cried down by the later fathers; who maintained, that the angels had, through the grace of God, become confirmed in holiness. That they were divided into various classes, was frequently asserted; even before the pseudo-*Dionysius Areopagita* published a formal theory on the subject.

Reference. *Dionys. Areop.* de Hierarchia coelesti.

Sec. 40. *Invocation of angels.*

However much the ancient churches might respect the angels, the proofs of their praying to them are, at least, not certain. The first intimation of it, is to be found, in *Ambrose*:(1) and yet in his age, and even afterwards, opinions against it are to be met with. *Gregory*(2) the Great believed, that the angels were worshipped in the times of the Old Testament; but not, that christians should worship them.

(1) de Viduis; Opp. T. I. p. 146.
(2) Expos. in Cant. Cant. c. 8. Opp. T. II. p. 56.
See *Euseb.* Praep. Evan. VII. c. 15. *Athanas.* contra Arian. Orat. IV. Council of Laodocea, Can. 35. in *Mansi* Concil. T. II. p. 570. *Epiphan.* Haeret. LXXIX. n. 5 and 7.

Sec. 41. *Apostacy of Angels.*

That there were certain spirits, wicked by nature, and of whom God was not the creator; was maintained by some Gnostic sects, by the Manichaens, and by the Priscilianists. But in opposition to these sects, the catholic church maintained, that the devil and his angels were creatures, whom God created holy, and who had plunged themselves into sin and wretchedness, by their own voluntary act. Respecting the first transgression of the devil, there were different opinions; yet the belief, that many of the angels sinned, by having intercourse with the daughters of men, was very general, in the early ages(1); and was first controverted by *John Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Cyril* of Alexandria, and *Theodoret.*

(1) So thought *Eusebius*, Praep. Evan. V. c. 4. *Ambrose*, de Noe et arca. c. 4, and *Sulpicius Severus*, Hist. Sacra I. c. 3.

Sec. 42. *Power and influenee of evil spirits.*

The early christians had terrific conceptions of the power of demons; yet they did not suppose it to be unlimited, but regarded it as controled by God. The whole worship of the pagans, they considered as paid to demons, and as instituted by them. The persecutions of the christians, the establishment of heresies, and innumerable temptations to sin, were attributed to *their* influence. Such as were not christians, were supposed to be *all* under the dominion of the devil; who had no power over christians, without their consent, and who took to flight whenever they prayed or made the sign of the cross.

Sec. 43. *The prospects of evil spirits.*

That punishment and misery would be the lot of the devil and the demons, was not doubted at all. That they might one day be reclaimed and become happy, was admitted by *Origen;* but, though some respectable

fathers, as *Didymus* and *Gregory* of Nyssa, embraced the same opinion, it was rejected by most of the fathers, was violently assailed by *Theophilus*, *Jerome*, and *Augustine*, and was proscribed by the Emperor Justinian.(1)

(1) See the references, above, Sec. 33.

CHAPTER III.

THE TRUTH OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Sources of our information. The Gr. Apologists ; namely, *Justin Martyr*, Opp. *Tatian.* Orat. *Athenagoras*, Legatio ; *Theophilus*, ad Autolyc. Libri III. *Hermias*, Irrisio gentil. Philosoph. ed. Benedict. (by *Prudentius Maran.*) Hagae Com. 1742. Also *Clemens Alex.* Exhort. ad Graec. *Tertullian*, Apologet. *Minucius Felix*, Octavius ; *Cyprian*, de Idolor. vanitate ; *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes, Libri VII. *Lactantius*, Instit. divin. Libri VII. and Epitome; *Athanasius*, Orat. contra Gent. *Eusebius Caesar.* Praeparatio Evan. Libri XV. and Demonstratio Evan. Libri X. *Jul. Firm. Maternus*, de Errore profanor. gentium. *Ambrose* in Symmach. Epp. II. *Augustine*, de Civitate Dei, Libri XXII. *Theodoret*, Graecanicor, morbor. curatio. *Origen*, adv. Celsum, Libri VII ; and *Cyril*, contra Jul. Libri X.

Histories written. Ch. F. Eisenlohr, Argumenta ab Apologetis Secul. II. ad confirmandam religionis Christ. veritatem ac praestantiam, contra Gentiles usurpata ; Tubing, 1797. 4to.
History of apologetics ; (in German,) *by H. G. Tzschirner*, I. vol. Lips. 1805.

Sec. 44.

All the preceding doctrines were received by the christians, though with some modifications, entirely from the Jews. But new fields of investigation opened, in the contests with the pagans, as the rapid spread of christianity called forth their opposition. A series of apologists

attempted, to evince the absurdity of the pagan religions, and the vast superiority of christianity; and likewise to repel the attacks of the pagans. The controversy with the Jews, was less important; being nearly confined to the interpretation of the ancient predictions, respecting the Messiah.

Sec. 45. *Attacks on Paganism.*

The christian Apologists assailed the popular idolatry, with great force; exposed its absurdities; and explained the prodigies and oracles, by which it was supported, to to be works of evil spirits. Nor did they spare the doctrines of the philosophers; but represented them, as partly borrowed from the holy scriptures of the Jews, and partly, as unsuccessful attempts to explain, in some tolerable manner, the popular religions. The philosophers were held up to distrust; on account of their disagreement in sentiments, and their hypocrisy, in taking part in that idolatry which they secretly despised and ridiculed.

Sec. 46. *The evidences of christianity.*

Besides the remark occasionally made, that it was safer, to embrace christianity than to reject it; the ancient divines considered the internal excellence, and the effects of christianity, as the principal grounds for believing in it. They accordingly compared the christian doctrines with the sayings of the most distinguished pagan sages; sometimes, to show their striking coincidence, and sometimes, to make the visible superiority of the former more glaring. They appealed to what christianity had done, and was able to do, for elevating the minds of men; and they adduced, as decisive proofs of this, the constancy of the martyrs, and the strict morality of the ascetics.

Sec. 47. *Prophecy and Miracles.*

On the *prophecies*, particularly those of the Old Testament, the christian divines, (with the exception of the Gnostics and Manichaeans) laid great stress. The Sibyl-

line Oracles also, and other similar spurious works, were sometimes cited for confirmation. Some of them attempted to describe the points of disagreement, between the divine predictions and those of Demons. The proof from *miracles* was likewise often brought forward; and it was vindicated, against the objection that Demons could also work miracles, and that Apollonius of Tyanea performed as great wonders as Jesus Christ did. The continuance of miraculous powers in the christian churches, was generally believed. *Augustine* was the first that attempted to define, accurately, a miracle.

Sec. 48. *Other external proofs.*

The christians urged the antiquity of their faith, as proof of its truth. For this purpose, they sometimes appealed to the testimony of ancient pagan writers, who had taught the unity of God; and many of them did not hesitate to make use of supposititious books. At other times, they alleged, that the substance of their religion was taught, in the Old Testament, long before the pagan writers lived. Likewise the elevated character of Jesus, which excluded all suspicion of imposture, and the credibility of the Apostles, were adduced as arguments. Lastly, it was maintained that the extraordinary success, with which their doctrine was propagated, by indigent fishermen, was inexplicable, if this doctrine was not the truth of God, and attended with the power of God.

Sec. 49. *Objections to Christianity.*

Not only were there widely extended popular prejudices against christianity, which the Apologists endeavored to do away; but a *Celsus*, a *Porphyry*, an *Hierocles*, and the Emperor *Julian*, composed written attacks on christianity. A part of these objections to the christian doctrine, respected its origination. It was urged against it, that it was derived from the barbarians; that it was set up by insignificant and ignorant men; and that it was strange, God should not have communicated to mankind, at an earlier period, a doctrine of so much pretended value.

Sec. 50. *Objections to the nature of the christian religion, and to its sacred books.*

Christianity was sometimes assailed, on the grounds, of its requiring of men a blind faith, of advancing fabulous and absurd notions, and of being prejudicial to the state, and making bad citizens. To the sacred books, it was objected, that the style of them was inelegant; and that they contained contradictions; as well as other things unworthy of God, which the christians were unable to conceal, except by forced interpretations.

Sec. 51. *Objections to the conduct and the influence of Christians.*

The christians themselves were sometimes charged, with receiving all sorts of characters into their societies; with being disunited among themselves; with separating from all other men, in the insolence of their pride; and with bidding welcome to death, in the obstinacy of their fanaticism. Still more frequently was it asserted, that the superior excellence of paganism was apparent, in the success, which had attended the Romans; and that the worthlessness of christianity was visible, in the misfortunes of its professors; and in the continual and manifest decline of the Roman empire, since the introduction of christianity. This last objection, *Augustine* and *Orosius* deemed worthy of an extended examination.

Sec. 52. *Neglect of Apologetics.*

After the middle of the fifth century, little attention was given to the evidences of christianity; because, it had no longer dangerous opposers; and because learning declined, and a blind faith became more and more prevalent. Yet against the Jews, polemics were sometimes resorted to, without effect.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BEING AND CHARACTER OF GOD.

Historian. Chr. Fr. Rösler, D. Philosophia veteris ecclesiae de Deo; Tubing. 1782. 4to.

Sec. 53. *Occasions for attention to the subject.*

The efforts made, to establish the truth and divinity of the christian religion, necessarily led to a careful investigation of the doctrine of a God. For the christians wished, on the one hand, to free themselves from the suspicion of atheism; and on the other, to establish the excellence of their religion, by showing, that it inculcated more worthy conceptions of God, than the heathen polytheism. Moreover, some heretical sects advanced notions, concerning God, creation and providence, which contravened the general creed; and which called for a confutation from the catholics.

Sec. 54. *Evidences for the existence of God.*

Although the fathers considered all true knowledge of God, as derived from a divine revelation; yet they admitted, that reason also affords satisfactory evidence of the *existence* of God. They most frequently appealed to the order and manifest design, discoverable throughout nature, as the ground of belief in the existence of a wise Creator and Governor. They moreover appealed, frequently, to the innate idea of a God, in the soul, and to the consent of all nations. The former, or cosmological proof, was advanced by *Diodorus*(1) of Tarsus; and the latter, or proof from the general idea of an existing Deity, engaged the attention of *Augustine*(2) and *Boethius*.(3)

(1) See *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. 223. p. 662.
(2) de Libero Arbitrio L. II. c. 5—15.
(3) de Consolat. Philos. L. III. prosa 10. p. 154, 155.

Sec. 55. *Unity of God.*

The christians had to defend the doctrine of *one God, first*, in opposition to the Pagan polytheism: and for this purpose, they urged, that the idea of a *supreme* Being, excluded all *participaters* with him; they also urged, that the unity of the world, indicated to us one sole author of it; and they likewise argued, from the consent of the most respectable Pagan philosophers. They had, *secondly*, to contend against the *dualism* of the *Gnostics* and *Manichaeans;* and therefore labored to evince the absurdity of supposing *two* Gods, an evil and a good one.(1) And, *thirdly*, they did not neglect to vindicate their doctrine of a Trinity, from the charge of being inconsistent with pure monotheism.

(1) *Titus*, of Bostra, contra Manichaeos, L. I. in Basnagii Monum. T. I. p. 63 &c.

Sec. 56. *The nature of God.*

The ancient fathers vied, in their efforts, to describe in the strongest terms, the infinite greatness and boundless majesty of God. No words, said they, can express the greatness of God. No description is adequate to it. He is above all beings; and, as the pseudo-Dyonisius asserts, above all existence. Although *Melito*, (1) *Tertullian*,(2) *Audius*,(3) and numerous Monks of Egypt, ascribed something corporeal to God; yet the others held, that he was uncorporeal; and at times, that he was the only uncorporeal being. And after all, it often appears, that it was very difficult, for the fathers, to exclude all notions of extension from their ideas of God.

(1) See *Origen*, in Genes. Opp. T. II. p. 25.
(2) de Carne Christi, c. 11. adv. Prax. c. 7.
(3) See *Epiphanius*, Haer. LXX. and *Theodoret*, Haeret. fab. L. IV. c. 10.

Sec. 57. *Investigations of the attributes of God.*

The notion of *Origen*, that God's knowledge and power are not absolutely boundless, was universally rejected, by the succeeding fathers. The eternity of God, was supposed to exclude all ideas of succession. Efforts were made, to show *how* the freedom of human actions, can consist with the foreknowledge of God. Investigations were also entered into, respecting the will, and the rectitude, of God.

Sec. 58. *Creation of the world.*

Sources of information. Basil, in Hexaëmeron:—*Ambrose*, in Hexaëm.—*Gregory* of Nyssa, in Hexaëm.—*Augustine*, de Genesi contra Manich. and de Genesi ad literam;—*Zacharias*, de Mundi creatione, contra Philosophos;—*Joannes Philoponus*, de Creatione mundi.

The belief, that God was the Creator of the world, was of vast importance, in the view of christians; and the dissent of the Grecian philosophers, and of the Gnostics, from this tenet, was the occasion of their carefully investigating the doctrine. The first proposition they advanced, was, that not any subordinate being or Demiurge, but the supreme God, the Father of Jesus Christ, created the world, by his Son. To this proposition, they added a second, that not only the *form*, but the *matter* of the world, originated from God. Both these were maintained by *Tertullian*, against *Hermogenes*. The peculiar idea of *Origen*, that there was a series of worlds, either created, or without beginning; was contested by *Methodius*, and rejected by the subsequent fathers.

Sec. 59. *The design of Creation.*

A third proposition, advanced respecting creation, was, that God was not merely the author, but the *voluntary* author, of the world. He gave existence to the world, it was stated, being moved by his goodness, or on our account. The creation of the world of spirits, was some-

times, distinguished from the creation of this material world. And *Origen* regarded the latter, as designed for the residence of the spirits, which once were equal with the others, but now were to be punished for sins they had committed. The idea was attacked by *Methodius*, became more and more regarded as erroneous, and in the sixth century was pronounced heresy. The Mosaic account of the creation, was sometimes, explained allegorically; but more frequently, was regarded as explicit history.

Sec. 60. *Divine Providence.*

Sources of our information. *John Chrysostom*, de Providentia Libri III;—*Theodoret*, Orationes X. de Providentia ;—*Salvian*, de Gubernatione Dei Liber.

The doctrine of God's providence, was likewise of very great importance, in the view of christians. They vindicated it, against the Epicurean notions ; against the notion of an irresistible fate; and against the supposed influence of the stars. Much the same arguments were used, in support of this doctrine, as for the existence of God. The peculiar sentiments were, that several of the fathers conceived the angels to be the instruments, by which God's providence over particular individuals and countries was executed; and that *Jerome*(1) did not extend God's providence to iudividual brutes, but only to the species of them.

(1) Comment in Abac. c. 1. Opp. T. VI. p. 148.

Sec. 61. *Theodicée, or, origin of evil.*

To explain the origin of sin in the world, the *Gnostics* and the *Manichaeans* brought forward their peculiar notion, of *two* original Beings; and toward this idea, *Lactantius*(1) made some approaches. The other catholic fathers took the ground, that God could not be the author of evil; and they maintained, that evil proceeded from the will of free agents, with God's permission; and that

physical evils are not to be accounted evil, being suspended over us for our best good. *Origen*(2), in particular, considered all evils as punishments, which human souls had merited while in their previous state.

(1) Instit. div. II. 8. and de Ira Dei c. 13.
(2) de Princip. II. c. 9. and III. c. 5 &c.

CHAPTER V.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

Historians of it. *George Bull,* Defensio fidei Nicaenae; and Judicium ecclesiae catholicae de necessitate credendi, quod Dominus noster J. C. sit verus Deus;—in Bp. Bull's Works, edited by I. E. Grabe; Lond. 1703. Fol.—*Lucae Mellier,* (*Sam. Crell,*) Fides primorum Christianorum; Lond. 1697. 8vo. Tractatus III; quorum primus Antinicaenismus dicitur; in secundo—Responsio—ad Bulli defensionem; authore *Gilberto Clerke.* Argumentum postremi, vera et antiqua fides de divinitate Christi, asserta contra Bulli judicium; (Lond.)1695. 8vo. Disquisitiones modestae in Bulli defensionem fidei Nicaenae; authore *Daniele Withby,* ed 2. Lond. 1720.

La Platonisme devoilé, ou Essai touchant le Verbe Platonicien; à Colone, 1700. 8vo. Also in a German translation, with an Appendix; by *J. Fr. Chr. Löffler,* 2d ed. 1792. 8vo.

(*J. A. Stark,*) Essay of a History of Arianism; (in German,) Berlin. 1783. 2 vol. 8vo.

Ch. Dan. Ant. Martini, Essay of a philosophical history of the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, in the IV. first centuries from the christian era; (in German,) 1st vol. Rostock and Lips. 1801. 8vo.

Historical account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; (German,) in *W. C. L. Ziegler's* theolog. Abhandlungen, vol. I. Goting. 1791.

Sec. 62. *The general doctrine of Christians.*

According to the instructions of Christ, (Matt. xxviii. 19,) the christians professed faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Catholic christians rejected, alike, the opinions of the *Ebionites*, that Jesus was a mere man; and the opinion of the *Gnostics*, that he was an Aeon, who descended from the Pleroma and became visible to mortals. Respecting the consummate perfection and majesty of the Father, there was no disagreement among them; but the more they labored to define the nature of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and the mode of their relation to the Father, the more they disagreed. Yet all their differences may be traced to the influence of one or the other of two fundamental ideas; the one, that of a *Unity*, the other, that of a *Trinity*.

Reference. Some remarks on the most early history of the doctrine of the Trinity; (in German,) by *J. E. C. Schmidt*: in his Bibliothek für Kritick and Exegese, vol. II. P. II. Herborn &c. 1798.

Sec. 63. *Unitarians.*

Various christians made it their great object, so to explain the relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as not to endanger the *unity*, and the sole supremacy of God. They believed, this danger would be best avoided, by considering the Son and the Spirit, not as distinct *persons*, but as the powers and energies of the Father. So thought *Praxeas*(1); and after him, *Noëtus* and *Sabellius;* with whom also, *Paul* of Samosata agreed, in substance. The adherents to this idea, were called *Patripassians;* and were subsequently more regarded as errorists.

(1) *Tertull.* adv. Prax. c. 1, 2.

Note. The earliest traces of this mode of viewing the subject, are in *Justin M.* Dial. cum Tryph. p. 221. Whether *Athenagoras* was one of this class, deserves inquiry. See his Legatio, p. 302; comp. p. 286, 287.

Sec. 64. *The early Trinitarians.*

The other fathers, as *Justin Martyr*(1), *Theophilus*(2) of Antioch, and *Tatian*(3), believed that, the distinctness of the Son from the Father, was too clearly taught in the scriptures, to be denied. They therefore maintained, that the Son, or as St. John called him, the divine Logos, was from eternity, *in God*, as an attribute or property; but that, before the creation, he proceeded forth from God, according to his good pleasure; and thenceforth began to have a separate existence: and they elucidated the subject, by the examples of *words* enunciated, and of *fires* kindled. According to them, the Son was of the essence of the Father; yet inferior to him, and a visible being. Concerning the Holy Ghost, these fathers expressed themselves less distinctly; yet they seem to have regarded him, as a distinct subject or person.

(1) Apol. maj. § 6. p. 47. (ed. Col. p. 56.) and § 13. p. 51, 63, 92. Dial. 151, 152, 157, 158, 195, 222.
(2) ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 355, 360, 365.
(3) Orat. p. 247, 248. (ed. Col. p. 145.)

Reference. *C. A. G. Keil.* A patristic inquiry, whether the earliest fathers distinguished between the Son and the H. Spirit; and what views they had of the subject; (in German,) in *I. F. Flatt's* Magazin für christl. Dogmatik und Moral. Pt. IV. p. 34 &c.

Sec. 65. *Source of this theory.*

To this theory the way was led, by the explanation of the Logos of John, by means of passages in the Old Testament; in which there was mention of the creative *Power* of God, (Gen. i.) and of the divine *Wisdom*, (Prov. viii. Ecclus. xxiv. Wisdom, vii.) *Theophilus*(1) now discriminated between the λογος ἐνδιαθετος and the λογος προφορικος (the *Word inherent* and the *Word sent forth:*) and was also the first, who used the word τριας (Trinity.) The Platonic philosophy, (not however the pure Platonism, but that which

was combined with the emination system, as it was taught at Alexandria, and as *Philo* had before exhibited it,) led them to discover all this, in the Old Testament.

(1) ad Autol. p. 265, 355, 360.

Sec. 66. *Irenaeus and Tertullian.*

With those early fathers, *Irenaeus*(1) agreed, in separating the Son and the Spirit from the Father, and in considering the two former, as inferior to the latter; but he differed from them, in making the Son *co-eternal* with the Father, and rejecting all further inquiries respecting his origin. *Tertullian*(2) agreed more closely with those fathers; yet was led by his confutation of Praxeas, to carry out their system more perfectly. He taught a Trinity, in which the members or persons, were indeed equal, in substance, yet so subsecutive to each other, that the second depended on the first, and the third on the second. Against the objection, that the unity of God was thus impaired, he believed that he guarded sufficiently, by representing the Father, to be the sole original source of all things, and even of the Son and the Holy Ghost. The subsequent Latin Fathers, *Cyprian*(3) and *Novatian*(4), have nothing peculiar, on this doctrine: and *Lactantius*(5) explains the origination of the Son, in a very sensual manner.

(1) adv. Haeres. I. c.10, 26. II. 13, 25, 28, 30. III. 6, 18, 19, IV. 6, 7,20. V. 1, 18.
(2) adv. Praxeam.
(3) Testim. adv. Jud. II. c. 1—8. Ep. 73, ad Jubai. p.202, 203. Ep. 74. ad Pompei. p. 213.
(4) de Trinitate.
(5) Instit. divin. II. 8. and IV. 6, 8, 29.

Sec. 67. *Clement and Origen.*

Clement(1) of Alexandria, describes the Son as a being who, in perfection, comes near the Father, and is the very image of him; and who is not confined to place, but om-

nipresent. *Origen(2)* defended the pre-existence of the Son, against Beryllus of Bostra; and he subjoined to the views of his preceptor, the idea of an eternal generation. Yet he did not reject the subordination of the Son to the Father; which he indicated, by applying to them the titles, ὁ θεος and θεος (*God* and *a God;*) by discriminating the part of each in creation, in the use of ὑπο and δια *(by* and *through;)* and by directing to pray *unto* (προς) the one, *by* or *through* (δια) the other. The Holy Spirit, he held to be a distinct *person*, produced by the Son, and inferior to him.

(1) Cohort. ad Gr. p. 78, 82, 86. *Paedag.* I. c. 6. p. 123. Strom. IV. p. 635. V. p. 654, 699, 710. VI. p. 769. VII. p. 831, 832.
(2) Opp. ed. de la Rue. Tom.I. p. 47, 48, 53, 55, 59, 62, 579, 750. II. p. 1. III. 50 &c. 60, 235.

Sec. 68. *Dionysius Alex. and Dionys. Rom.*

The disciples of Origen, appear to have adhered to *his* views respecting the Logos, except only in regard to the eternal generation. One of them, *Dionysius*(1) Bishop of Alexandria, wished to express strongly, that the Son was distinct from the Father, in opposition to *Sabellius;* and without intending to introduce any new doctrine, he stated the Son, to be a *creature*, and not to possess the same essence with the Father, and to have had a beginning of existence. But such assertions now awakened attention, and gave offence. *Dionysius(2)* Bishop of Rome, thought it his duty, to oppose these opinions; and he insisted, that the Son was not created, but *begotten*; that his existence had no commencement; and that he was *one* with the Father. This induced the Bishop of Alexandria, to explain himself. He said that he wished to discriminate the Son from the Father, but not to *sunder* them; that the Son *did* always exist; that he declined using the word ὁμοουσιος, because it did not occur in the scriptures, but the meaning of it he did not reject.

(1) See *Athanasius*, de Sententia Dionys. contra Arianos; in Athanas. Opp. T. I. p. 551 &c. ed. Col.
(2) See *Athanasius*, de Decret. Syn. Nicaenae, p. 275, 276.

Sec. 69. *Rise of the Arian controversy.*

The discussions at Alexandria, respecting the nature of the Son of God, produced in the beginning of the fourth century a violent contest. *Arius* was dissatisfied with the old views, that the Son was from eternity, *in* the Father; and that before the creation he proceeded forth from the Father; because such an emanation implied that, God was corporeal and divisible into parts. He therefore taught, that the Son had a beginning of his existence, and was created by the Father, out of nothing, according to his free choice. His Bishop, Alexander, opposed him; in order to maintain the eternal generation of the Son from the Father, and divest him of the appellation of a *creature*.

Sec. 70. *The council of Nice.*

The contest between the two men, in its progress, became obstinate; and as each of them found adherents, it spread over the whole Roman empire. In vain the Emperor *Constantine* attempted to calm the storm; and therefore, he at last called the general council, which met at Nice, A.D. 325. There the doctrine of Arius was rejected; and a Confession of Faith was drawn up, which asserted that the Son was ὁμοουσιος *(of the same essence)* with the Father, and begotten of the essence of the Father. By the emperor's command, all Bishops were obliged to subscribe to this creed.

The Nicene Creed. Πιϛευομεν εἰς ἑνα Θεον πατερα παντοκρατορα, παντων ὁρατων τε και ἀορατων ποιητην. Και εἰς ἑνα κυριον Ιησουν Χριϛον, τον υἱον του θεου, γεννηθεντα ἐκ του πατρος μονογενη, τουτ' ἐϛιν, ἐκ της ουσιας του πατρος, Θεον εκ Θεου, Φως ἐκ Φωλος, Θεον ἀληθινον εκ Θεου ἀληθινου, γεννηθεντα ου ποιηθεντα, ὁμοουσιον τῳ πατρι, δι' ου τα παντα ἐγενετο, τα τε ἐν τῳ ουρανῳ και τα εν τῃ γῃ, τον δι' ἡμας τους

ἀνθρωπους, και δια την ἡμετεραν σωτηριαν κατελθοντα, και σαρκωθεντα, ἐνανθρωπησαντα, παθοντα και ἀνασταντα τῃ τριτῃ ἡμερᾳ, ἀνελθοντα εἰς τους ὐρανους, και ἐρχομενον κριναι ζωντας και νεκρους. Και εἰς το ἁγιον πνευμα. Τους δε λεγοντας, ὁτι ἠν ποτε ὁτε ὐκ ἠν, και πριν γεννηθηναι ὐκ ἠν, και ὁτι ἐξ ὐκ ὀντων ἐγενετο ἡ ἐξ ἑτερας ὑποστασεως ἡ ὐσιας φασκοντας ἐιναι, ἡ κτιστον τρεπτον ἡ ἀλλοιωτον τον ὐιον του Θεου, ἀναθεματιζει ἡ καθολικη ἐκκλησια.

Reference. *W. Münscher's* Examination of the sense of the Nicene Creed; (in German,) in Henke's neuem Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte, vol. VII. P. II.

Sec. 71. *Consequences of the council.*

Most of the Asiatic bishops were dissatisfied with the Nicene decisions, and particularly with the *likeness of essence* (ὁμοουσιος) there established. Even *Constantine*, the emperor, in the later years of his life, would not insist upon those decisions; and his son *Constantius*, openly favored the opposers. Council after council was held, and one creed after another drawn up. The immoveable firmness of Athanasius only, could prevent the Nicene doctrine from sinking, under its overpowering enemies and their reiterated assaults.

Notices. The Antoichean confession was formed A.D. 341. The long (μακροστιχος) formula, A. D. 343. The Council of Sardica and Philippopolis, A. D. 347. The two Creeds of Sirmium, A. D. 351, 357. The Council of Ancyra, A. D. 358. The third Sirmian Creed, and the Councils of Rimini and Seleucia, A. D. 359.

Sec. 72. *Arian parties.*

The opposers of the Nicene creed, were themselves divided in opinion. The *pure Arians*, at the head of whom were *Aëtius* and *Eunomius*, considered the Son, as the most exalted *creature* of God; and in *essence*, *unlike* to the Father. The *Semi-Arians*, as they were denominated, acknowledged the Son to be, of *like essence* (ὁμοιουσιος) with the Father. Others, as *Cyril* of Jerusa-

lem—either rejected the word ὁμοσσιος; or explained it, as *Eusebius* of Caesarea, according to their own views.

Sec. 73. *Marcellus and Photinus.*

A very different course was taken by *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra, and his disciple *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium; for they, like *Paul* of Samosata, distinguished the Logos from the Son of God; and explained the *generation* of the latter, as being nothing but his assumption of human nature. *Marcellus* hereby incurred a doubtful reputation; and *Photinus* drew on himself the united condemnation of both Arians and Catholics.

References. *Eusebius*, contra Marcellum, Lib. II. and de Theologia ecclesiastica Lib. III. Marcelliana; edidit et animadvers. instruxit, *Chr. Hen. G. Rettberg*, Gotting. 1794. 8vo.

Sec. 74. *Athanasian system.*

Athanasius not only held firmly to the Nicene creed, as the foundation of orthodoxy, but he attributed to it more, than it properly contained. He described the *generation* of the Son, as being an *eternal*, *mysterious*, *operation* of the Father; proceeding, not from the *will*, but from the *nature* of the Father; and whereby, the son possessed the same essence with the Father. He it was also, that felt the necessity of maintaining the equality of the Holy Ghost with the Father and the Son, (concerning which, the church had hitherto defined nothing,) and of requiring the profession of it, as a mark of orthodoxy; after the year 362, when the controversy with *Macedonius* directed attention to the subject.

Sec. 75. *Triumph of this doctrine.*

By the activity and prudence of *Athanasius*, and the zeal and influence of his co-workers, (*Basil*, the two *Gregories*, *Hilary*, and *Ambrose*,) and the disagreement among the Arians, and the powerful support of some of the emperors; this doctrine acquired an increasing pre-

ponderancy. The council of Constantinople A.D. 381, condemned the Arians and Macedonians, confirmed the Nicene creed, and made some additions to it, the most important of which respected the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

[Πιστευομεν εἰς το πνευμα το ἁγιον] το κυριον, το ζωοποιον, το ἐκ του πατρος ἐκπορευομενον, το συν πατρι και υἱῳ συμπροσκυνεμονον, και συνδοξαζομεμον, το λαλησαν δια των προφητων.

The principal writers concerning the Son: Athanas. Expos. fidei, contra Arianos Oratt. IV. *Hilary* of Poictiers, de Trinit. Lib. X. *Basil* the Great, contra Eunomium, Lib. III. *Gregory* of Nyssa, contra Eunom. Lib. XII. *Gregory* of Nazianz. Orationes V. de Theologia. *Ambrose*, de Fide, ad Gratianum, Lib. V.

Concerning the Holy Ghost. Athanas. IV. Epp. ad Serapionem. *Basil*, de Spiritu Sancto, ad Amphilochium Liber. *Didymus*, de. Sp. S. *Ambrose*, de Sp. S.

Sec. 76. *Fuller statement of the doctrine of the Trinity.*

In accordance with the Athanasian doctrine, the unity of essence, and the trinity of persons, in the Godhead, were maintained; and in relation to which, the words ὐσια and ὑποστασις were sometimes used as synonymous, and sometimes as differing in import. Appropriate attributes (ἰδιοτητες) were ascribed to each Person; to the Father, his being *unbegotten* (ἀγεννησια); to the Son, a being *begotten* (γεννησια); to the Holy Ghost, *procession* (ἐκπορευσις, ἐκπεμψις). Respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, or from the Father *and* the Son, there was a difference of opinion, between the Greeks and the Latins: and in the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, the words *et filio* were added to the Constantinopolitan Creed.

Reference. J. G. Walch, Historia controversiae Graecorum et Latinorum de processione Spiritus S. Jenae, 1751. 8vo. Historia succincta controversiae de processione Spir. Sancti; authore *Christ. Matth. Pfaff.* Tub. 1749. 4to.

Sec. 77. *Subsequent statements.*

The subsequent writers held strongly, to this system of doctrine. Yet *Augustine* had something peculiar; for he effaced the traces of unlikeness and subordination, which had existed from before the times of the Nicene Council; and he insisted on the numerical unity of the three Persons. In accordance with his views, the relations of the three Persons were more distinctly set forth, in what is called, the *Athanasian Creed.* The charge of *tritheism*, brought against certain Monophysites, as *John Askuanages* and *John Philiponus*, arose from philosophical speculations, and rested on mere inferences.

Reference. Augustine, de Trinitate Libri XV.

Athanasian Creed. Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus habet, ut teneat catholicam fidem. Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in aeternum peribit. Fides autem catholica haec est, ut unum Deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur, neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes. Alia enim est persona patris, alia filii, alia spiritus sancti; sed patris et filii et spiritus sancti una est divinitas, aequalis gloria et aequalis majestas. Qualis pater, talis filius, talis et spiritus sanctus. Increatus pater, increatus filius, increatus spiritus sanctus. Immensus pater, immensus filius, immensus et spiritus sanctus. Aeternus pater, aeternus filius, aeternus et spiritus sanctus; et tamen non tres aeterni sed unus aeternus, sicut non tres increati, nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus et unus immensus. Similiter omnipotens pater, omnipotens filius, omnipotens et spiritus sanctus; et tamen non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens. Ita Deus pater, Deus filius, deus et spiritus sanctus; et tamen non tres dii, sed unus est Deus. Ita dominus pater, dominus filius, dominus et spiritus sanctus; et tamen non tres sunt domini, sed unus dominus. Quia sicut singillatim unamquamque personam et deum et dominum confiteri christiana veritate compellimur, ita tres deos aut dominos dicere catholica religione prohibemur. Pater a nullo est factus nec creatus nec genitus. Filius a patre solo est, non factus, non creatus sed genitus. Spiritus sanctus a

patre et filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus est, sed procedens. Unus ergo pater, nec tres patres, unus filius, non tres filii, unus spiritus sanctus, non tres spiritus sancti. Et in hac trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt et coaequales. Ita ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et unitas in trinitate et trinitas in unitate veneranda sit. Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de trinitate sentiat.

CHAPTER VI.

DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Sec. 78. *First germs of it.*

The early catholic fathers had to contend, against the *Ebionites*, and against the *Gnostics*. The former held Christ, to be a *mere man;* the latter regarded him, as having no part in humanity, but as being an exalted *Spirit*, who either assumed the mere appearance of a body, or brought with him from heaven a more refined body. According to the catholic doctrine, both these opinions were to be rejected; and yet the Alexandrians so far leaned towards Gnosticism, as to deny that Christ's body was homogeneous with ours. As to the *manner*, in which the divine nature was united with the human in Christ, very indistinct ideas prevailed. The earliest fathers(1) maintained only, that the divine Logos assumed a human *body*. A human *soul* of Christ, was first obscurely mentioned, by *Tertullian*(2); afterwards, a rational soul was expressly maintained, by *Origen*(3): and he first attempted, to set forth a theory respecting the incarnation; namely, that the Logos united himself with a rational soul, selected on account of its pre-eminent purity; and then, by means of this soul, joined himself to a human body.

(1) *Münscher's* Manual of dogm. history, vol. II. p. 167, &c.

(2) de carne Christi. c. 11, 13, and adv. Prax. c. 16.
(3) contra Cels. II. Sec. 9. and IV. Sec. 15—19, &c. passim. de Princip. II. c. 6.

Reference. G. J. Planck, Observationes quaedam in primam doctrinae de naturis Christi historiam. Got. 1787—89. also, in the Commentatt, theol. published by Velthusen, Kuinöl and Rupert. vol. I. p. 141 &c.

Sec. 79. *Developement of it.*

Such indefinite conceptions continued, down to the fourth century, when the Arian controversy directed attention to the subject; for the Arians, who attributed no human soul to Christ, drew arguments from the incarnation of Jesus, against the doctrine of the catholics. The catholic fathers, at first, were fluctuating in their explanations. *Appollinaris* bishop of Laodicea, taught that, the Logos assumed only *two* of the three parts of man, namely a body, and a sensitive soul; while the Logos supplied the place of the third part, or human reason. *Athanasius* maintained, at least in his later writings, and at the Council of Alexandria A. D. 362, that Christ possessed a rational, human soul. The opinion of Apollinaris, was combatted by *Gregory* of Nazianzum, and *Gregory* of Nyssa; and was condemned by *Damasus*, bishop of Rome, and by the general council at Constantinople, A. D. 381.

References. Athanasius, Ep. ad Epictetum. *Gregory* of Nyssa, Antirrheticus contra Apollinarem. *Gregory* of Naz. Epp. ad Cledonium. sive Oratt. LI. LII.

Sec. 80. *The natures of Christ.*

It was generally acknowledged, that there was but *one Christ*, to whom belonged both divine and human properties. Their care to maintain the *unity* of Christ, induced some fathers, to ascribe to him, a divine nature which *became* man; and this phraseology, which was used by *Athanasius* and *Apollinaris*, became prevalent in Egypt. Other fathers, following the example of the two *Gregories*, of Nazianzum and Nyssa, spoke of *two natures*

in Christ; and the Antiochian divines, *Diodorus* of Tarsus, and *Theodorus* of Mopsuestia, made the distinction of the two natures very prominent, in order to avoid the idea of their being mixed and confounded.

Sec. 81. *Nestorius and Cyril.*

After a contest on this subject, had been terminated in the West, by the recall of *Leporius;* a more fearful contest broke out, between the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Patriarch of Alexandria. *Nestorius* of Constantinople, having given offence by asserting, that Mary ought not to be called (Θεοτοκος) the *mother of God*; *Cyril* took occasion, to charge him with *dividing* Christ, into *two persons;* and incurred the accusation against himself, of *confounding* or of *changing* the natures of Christ. The Roman Bishop, *Coelestine*, took the side of Cyril; the Eastern Bishops were for Nestorius. Reciprocated execrations produced the highest degree of bitterness.

References. Cyrilli Anathematismi, cum reprehensionibus Andreae et Theodoreti, et Apologia Cyrilli:—in *Mansi* Collect. Concil. T. V. p. 1. and *Nestorii* Anathematismi; ibid. T. IV. p. 1099. T. V. p. 703, 748.

Sec. 82. *Council of Ephesus.*

The Emperor Theodosius, attempted to end the strife, by a general council, which he assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431; but it only exasperated the parties, and separated the Oriental Bishops from the Egyptian party. At last, *Cyril* resolved, to purchase the assent of the Antiochian party to the condemnation of Nestorius, by subscribing a formula, in which he admitted *two* natures in Christ. On these terms, the peace of the church was restored; yet the Persian christians became a separate community; and dissatisfaction remained on both sides.

Sec. 83. *The Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.*

In the attempt to force the Egyptian form of the doctrine upon the whole church, Dioscurus labored, in the

spirit of Cyril, but with better success. A controversy which arose at Constantinople, respecting *Eutyches*, afforded him an opportunity, in a new general council at Ephesus, A. D. 449, to put down the opposing party, although the Roman Bishop, *Leo* the Great, warmly remonstrated. Yet, soon after, his hard gained victory was again wrested from him, by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 461; and a precise formula, in regard to the contested points, was established.

References. *Leo Magn.* Ep. ad Flavianum: ed. Henke, Helmst. 1781, also in his Opusc. Arademica, Helmst. 1802. 8vo.

The formula of Chalcedon: Ἑπομενοι τοινυν τοις ἁγιοις πατρασιν, ἑνα και τον αὐτον ὁμολογεον υἱον τον κυριον ἡμων Ιησουν χριστον, συμφωνως ἁπαντες ἐκδιδασκομεν, τελειον τον αὐτον ἐν θεοτητι και τελειον τον αὐτον ἐν ἀνθρωποτητι, θεον ἀληθινον, και ἀνθρωπον ἀληθως τον αὐτον ἐκ ψυχης λογικης και σωματος, ὁμοουσιον τῳ πατρι κατα την θεοτητα, και ὁμοουσιον τον αὐτον ἡμιν κατα την ἀνθρωποτητα, κατα παντα ὁμοιον ἡμιν, χωρις ἁμαρτιας. προ ἀιωνων μεν ἐκ του πατρος γεννηθεντα κατα την θεοτητα, ἐπ' ἐσχατων δε των ἡμερων τον αὐτον δι' ἡμας και δια την ἡμετεραν σωτηριαν ἐκ Μαριας της θεοτοκου κατα την ἀνθρωποτητα, ἑνα και τον αὐτον χριστον, υἱον, κυριον, μονογενη, ἐκ δυο φυσεων (ἐν δυο φυσεσιν) ἀσυγχυτως, ἀτρεπτως, ἀδιαιρετως ἀχωριστως γνωριζομενον, ουδαμου της των φυσεων διαφορας ἀνηρημενης δια την ἑνωσιν, σωζομενης δε μαλλον της ἰδιοτητος ἑκατερας φυσεως και ἐς ἐν προσωπον και μιαν ὑποστασιν συντρεχουσης, ουκ ἐις δυο προσωπα μεριζομενον ἡ διαιρουμενον, ἀλλ' ἑνα και τον αὐτον υἱον και μονογενη, θεον λογον, κυριον Ἰησουν χριστον καθαπερ ἀνωθεν οἱ προφηται περι αὐτου, και αὐτος ἡμας ὁ κυριος Ἰησους ἐξεπαιδευσε και το των πατερων ἡμιν παραδεδωκε συμβολον.

Sec. 84. *Subsequent Contests.*

The formula of Chalcedon, did not meet universal approbation; and a numerous body of *Monophysites*, separated themselves from the other churches. The attempt of the Emperor *Zeno*, to win them back, by means of his *Henoticon*, produced no lasting effect. In the entire La-

tin church, and in a large part of the Greek church, the formula of Chalcedon was received; and it was annexed to the, so called, Athanasian Creed. The Monophysite contests were followed, by that of the *Theopaschites*, and that concerning the *three chapters*, (de tribus capitulis,) which were decided in the fifth general Council. There was also, dissension among the Monophysites, respecting the *incorruptibility of Christ's body;* in which the Emperor *Justinian* took part.

Reference. Second Part of the Athanasian Creed: Sed necessarium est ad aeternam salutem, ut incarnationem quoque domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia dominus noster Jesus Christus, dei filius, deus pariter et homo est. Deus est ex substantia patris ante saecula genitus: homo ex substantia matris in saeculo natus. Perfectus deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens, aequalis patri secundum divinitatem, minor patre secundum humanitatem. Qui licet deus sit et homo, non duo tamen sed unus est Christus; unus autem non conversione divinitatis in carnem, sed assumtione humanitatis in Deum. Unus omnio non confusione substantiarum sed unitate personae. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita et deus et homo unus est christus, qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in coelos, sedet ad dexteram patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Ad cuius adventum omnes homines resurgere debent cum corporibus suis, et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem, et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam aeternam, qui vero mala, in ignem aeternum. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisquam fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

CHAPTER VII.

DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION BY JESUS CHRIST.

Sec. 85. *The general and constant doctrine of the Church.*

That men need to be redeemed, because they are involved in ignorance, error, and sin; that Jesus Christ has promulged God's plan, for the redemption of men; that it is through him, they obtain forgiveness of sins, power and help to become virtuous, and the hope of blessedness; and that faith in Jesus Christ, forsaking sin, and practising goodness, are means for the attainment of the blessings of christianity; all christians, unitedly, and constantly, believed. But these simple propositions were capable of diversified explanations, and they gave rise to various questions and investigations; so that the teachers found abundant matter, to exercise and employ their powers of reflection and discrimination.

Sec. 86. *Nature of man.*

To explain the nature of redemption, we must keep in view the degeneracy of mankind; and not to cast the blame of this on God, we must go back to the nature and the original character of mankind. The universal doctrine of the church, was that God created mankind, and with ability to good; and especially, that he endued them with freedom. Yet it remained undetermined, whether man consists of *two*(1) parts, [body and soul,] or of *three*(2) [body, soul, and spirit;] whether the soul is to be considered as corporeal, as *Tertullian*(3), and after him many others supposed; and what origin is to be ascribed to the soul. In regard to the last point, the opinions of the *Gnostics*(4) and *Manichaeans*(5) were rejected; the early opinion, that the soul is a part or a breath from God(6), was gradually discarded; and *Origen's*(7) hypothesis, of the pre-existence of souls, sunk into dis-

repute, and was at last condemned. On the contrary, the two theories,—of the *creation*, and of the *derivation*, of the soul,—both prevailed, without either's gaining a complete ascendency.

(1) So *Tertullian*, and probably *Lactantius*.
(2) So *Clemens* Alex. and *Origen*.
(3) de Anima. c. 51.
(4) They held the *spirit* of man to be a *ray*, or *spark of light*, from the Pleroma; but the sensitive *soul*, to be the creation of the Demiurge.
(5) They held the rational soul, to be *a particle from the world of light*, stolen by the Prince of darkness; but the sensitive soul, to be the creation of the devil.
(6) So thought *Justin M.* (Dial. p. 106.) *Tatian*, (Orat. p. 253 &c.) and *Tertullian*, (de Anim. c. 3, 11.)
(7) de Princip. passim.

Sec. 87. *Endowments of men.*

The fathers speak most frequently, of two endowments of men; namely, the *immortality* of the soul, and the *image of God*. Some of the earlier fathers, as *Justin*(1), *Tatian*(2), *Theophilus*(3), and after them, *Arnobius*(4) and *Lactantius*(5), believed the soul to be, naturally, mortal; but that God rewards it with immortality. *Tertullian*(6), on the contrary, and *Origen*, who were followed by the subsequent fathers, supposed the soul to be immortal, in its nature; and they supported this opinion by various arguments(7). The *image of God* in men, some of the earlier fathers indeed referred to the *body*(8); but the Alexandrians(9) took pains, to suppress an opinion so gross. They(10) discriminated between the *image* of God, and *likeness* to him; understanding by the former, rational endowments; and by the latter, virtuous sensibilities. Most of the succeeding fathers(11) coincided with them; yet some of them explained the *image* of God, to denote *dominion* over the creatures. The Mosaic account of the state and the apostacy of the first human pair, was generally understood

to be proper history; but *Origen(12)*, viewing the literal sense of it, to be absurd, interpreted it allegorically.

(1) Dial. p. 107 &c.
(2) Orat. p. 249, 254.
(3) ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 368.
(4) adv. Gentes Lib. II. p.52 &c.
(5) Instit. div. VII. c. 5, 9, 10, 11 &c.
(6) de Anima c. 51.—Also *Irenaeus* adv. Haer. V. c. 4, 7. and II. c. 34.
(7) *Origen* argued from the *nature* of the soul, it being a *spirit*, like God and the angels, (de Princip. IV. § 36 :) also from the *longing* of the soul after immortality. Exhort. ad Martyros.
(8) *Justin M.* Fragm. de Resurrect. *Irenaeus* adv. Haeres. V. c. 6. *Clementina*, Homil. III. c. 8. *Lactant*, Instit. div. II. c. 10.
(9) *Clemens*, Strom. Lib. II. p. 483. *Origen*, contra Cels. in Opp. T. I. p. 680. and T. II. p. 57.
(10) *Clemens*, Strom. Lib. II. p. 499. *Origen*, Opp. T. I. p.522.
(11) *Irenaeus*, adv. Haeres. IV. c. 4,38. and V. c. 16. *Tertullian*, contra Marcion. Lib. II. c. 5, de Baptismo, c. 5.
(12) adv. Cels. Lib. IV. Opp. T.I. p. 530 &c. de. Princip. Lib. IV. p. 175.

Sec. 88. *Origin and propagation of sin, according to the Greek fathers.*

Historians: *J. G. Walch*, Historia doctrinae de Peccato originis ;—in his Miscell. sacra. A. D. 1744. 4to.
Jo. Horn, Commentatio de sententiis eorum patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali. Gotting. 1801. 4to.

According to the Gnostics, and the Manichaeans, the sinfulness of mankind, arose from their souls being connected with material bodies. The Greek fathers(1) believed that, in consequence of Adam's sin, not only he, but his posterity also, became mortal. But all *sin*, they traced to the free choice of men: yet they allowed, that

the temptations of evil spirits, and their own sensual inclinations, contributed thereto. Although they admitted, that since Adam's transgression, men were more easily led into sin; yet they ascribed to mankind, a power to resist all incitements to evil. *Methodius(2)*, in particular, assumed that, by Adam's apostacy, the souls of mankind became full of wicked propensities; yet that it depended on their own wills, whether they would gratify those propensities or not. The same ideas continued to be the prevailing ones, among the Greek fathers; and they were developed by no one, more clearly, than by *John Chrysostom*. The Alexandrians, *Clement* and *Origen*, never once traced the mortality of mankind, back to Adam's sin; but attributed it to the nature of the body. They rejected, in the most express terms, all *propagation* of sin and guilt; although Origen believed in an existing sinfulness of men, as they came into the world. With them, substantially, *Gregory* of Naz. and *Gregory* of Nyssa, appear to have agreed.

(1) *Justin Martyr*, Dial. p. 176, 206, 231. Apol. major. § 10. p. 49. § 61. p. 80. Apol. minor. p. 93.
Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis. p. 202—205.
Tatian, Orat. p. 146, 150, 152, 153, 249, 255, 261.
Theophilus Antioch. ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 368.
Clemens Alex. Strom. Lib. I. p. 368. II. p. 461, 463. III. p. 556, 557. IV. p. 633. VII. p. 894.
Origen, de Princip. Prooem. p. 48. Lib. III. c. 1. 2. and Opp. T. I. p. 260. T. II. p. 4. T. III. p. 947, 948.
Athanasius, Opp. T. I. p. 150, 638. (ed. Montf. T. I. p. 104. T. I. P. II. p. 944.)
Chrysostom, in Psal. L. Hom. II. Opp. T. III. p. 874, 875. in Ep. ad Rom. Hom. X. Tom. X. p. 125. Hom. XI. p. 137. Hom. XII. p. 153. Hom. XIII. p. 365.
Cyril of Jerus. Catech. II. § 1—3. p. 22. Catech. IV. c. 19. p. 61.
Titus of Bostra, contra Manichaeos, Lib. II. in Basnage, Monumenta, Tom. I. p. 97.
Basil the Great, Homil. *Quod Deus non sit auctor peccati*, p. 74, 76.

Gregory, Naz. de Orat. Dom. Orat. V. Opp. T. I. p. 755, 756.
Gregory, Nyss. Opp. T. I. p. 149—151. T. III. p. 329.
Nemesius, de Natura Hominis, c. 29—40.
Epiphanius, Haeres. XVI. § 4.
(2) in *Photius*, Biblioth. Cod. 234. p. 915. Cod. 236. p. 949.

SEC. 89. *Latin fathers, before Augustine.*

Tertullian(1), who believed in the propagation of souls, conceived the idea, that not only mortality, but likewise sinfulness, was propagated from Adam to his posterity. But though he maintained the propagated vitiosity of man, yet he was far from accounting mankind, incapable of good actions. He was followed by *Cyprian*(2) *Hilary* (3) of Poictiers, and *Ambrose*(4); and even *Augustine*(5) in his earlier writings, was of the same opinion. *Arnobius*(6) and *Lactantius*(7) dissented; but their views were not received, by the catholic churches.

(1) de Anima, c. 16, 40. contra Marcion, Lib. II. c. 6, 7.
(2) Ep. LXIV. ad Fidum. p. 161. de Opere et Eleem. p. 196. de Gratia, ad Donat. p. 2. de Idolor. vanitate, p. 13.
(3) in Ps. cxviii. Lit. 22. Sec. 4. p. 366.
(4) in Ps. cxviii. c. 7.
(5) de Lib. Arbitr. I. c. 13. II. c. 1. contra Faustum Manich. XXII. c. 78. de vera Relig. c. 14. (Opp. T. I. p. 756.) But otherwise, in his Retract. Lib. I. c. 14.
(6) adv. Gentes Lib. I. p. 15. (He believed the soul to be, not from God, but the workmanship of some inferior power or spirit; and therefore defective.)
(7) Instit. divin. II. c. 12. VI. c. 13. VII. c. 5. de Ira Dei, c. 15. (He supposed the *body*, to contaminate the soul.)

SEC. 90. *Early doctrine of divine aid to goodness.*

Historians. Gerh. Jo. Vossius, Historiae de controversiis quas Pelagius et ejus reliquiae moverunt, Lib. VII. ed. 2. Amstel. 1655. and in his Opp. Tom. VI.

Veritable tradition de l' Eglise sur la Predestination et la Grace; in *Jo. Launoii* Opp. T. I. P. II. p. 1065.

Christ. Matth. Pfaff, Specimen historiae dogmaticae de Gratia et Praedestinatione, in his Primitia Tubingens. Tub. 1718. 4to.

Jo. Ja. Hottinger, Fata doctrinae de praedestinatione et Gratia Dei salutari. Tiguri 1747. 4to.

Jo. Geo. Walch, Diss. de Pelagianismo ante Pelagium; in his Miscell. sacra. 1744.

Theological history of the doctrine and opinions of the church, in the five first centuries, respecting divine Grace, free Will, and Predestination; (in Italian,) Trent. 1742. Fol. (by *Scipio Maffei*). Also in Latin, by *Fr. Reifenberg*, Francf. 1756. Fol.

Jesus and his apostles, represent faith and reformation, sometimes as the work of man, and sometimes as being the gift of God. Hence efforts were made, to reconcile these opposite representations. The Greek church(1) took the ground of the *perfect freedom* of man's will; and therefore taught, that it depends on the purpose and exertions of man, to attain to faith and virtue; yet that the grace of God, comes in aid of man's exertions, by imparting to him strength, assistance, and excitements. Of course, man must render himself a fit subject of divine *grace;* which he has power to use properly, and also to abuse. These ideas, which were fully stated by *Clement*(2) and *Origen*(3), were also advanced by the fathers of the fourth century; by *Cyril*(4) of Jerusalem, *Gregory*(5) of Nazianzum, *Gregory*(6) of Nyssa, and clearest of all, by *Chrysostom*(7). The Latin fathers(8) did not deviate essentially. For, although they painted, in glowing colors, the excellence of divine grace, yet they left room, for the spontaneous activity of man to have a part in his reformation. An irresistable work of grace, and an unconditional election, were not thought of; and the divine purposes were always traced back to God's foreknowledge.

(1) See Justin Martyr, Apol. maj. Sec. 10. p. 48. and p. 61.

(2) Strom. Lib. II. p. 434, 462. IV. p. 633, 443. V. p. 645, 647. VI. p. 788. 832. VII. p. 860.
(3) de Princip. L. III. c. 1, 2. also Opp. T. I. p. 108 &c.
(4) Procateches. c. 1. Catech. I. Sec. 3. XIII. Sec. 1—4. XIV. Sec. 19, 22.
(5) Orat, XXXI, p. 504, 505.
(6) Orat. I. Opp. T. I. p. 150.
(7) in Genes. Homil. 22, 23, in Ep. ad Rom. Homil. 16. in Ep. ad Hebr. Homil. 12. (Opp. T. XII. p. 805—07.) in Ps. L. Homil. 2. de Ferendis reprehens. Homil. 13.
(8) *Irenaeus*, adv. Haeres. II. c. 37—39. *Tertullian*, de Anima, c. 21. adv. Marcion II. c. 5—8. *Minutius Felix*, Octav. c. 36. *Cyprian*, de Gratia Dei, ad Donat. p. 3, 4. Testim. adv. Judaeos, L. III. c. 52. *Arnobius*, adv. Gentes. L. II. p. 88, 89. *Lactantius*, Instit. divin. IV. c. 16. VI. c. 24. VII. c. 5. *Hilary* of Poict. in Psal. cxviii. Lit. V. § 14. Lit. VI. § 4. Lit. XVII. § 8. *Optatus Milevit.* de Schismate Donatist. II. c. 20. *Ambrose*, in Evang. Luc. L. II. c. 14. de Fuga Saeculi, c. 1. de Fide, ad Grat. L. V. c. 2.

Sec 91. *Conflict of Augustine with Pelagius.*

Historians of it. Cornelius Jansenius, Augustinus. Louv. 1640. Fol.

Dionys. Petavius, de Pelagianorum et Semipelagianorum dogmatum Historia; in his work, de Dogmatibus theolog. T. III. p. 304—335. de Prædestinatione et Reprobatione L. II. ibid. T. I. p. 343, 475.

Henry Noris, Historia Pelagiana; in his Opp. Veron. 1729. Tom. I.

Ch. Fr. W. Walch, History of Heresies; (in German,) vols. IV. and V.

Augustine, the renowned Bishop of Hippo, by his aims to glorify the grace of God, and by some passages of scripture, was led to a mode of thinking, which deviated from the earlier system of belief, and which attributed all goodness in men, exclusively, to divine operation. On this subject, he fell into a contest with *Pelagius* and *Coelestine*. And through the influence of his reputation, and the cooperation of the African churches, and of the

Bishop of Rome, the Pelagians were condemned, as heretics; notwithstanding the Council of Diospolis was favorable to them. This controversy related to the subjects of *sin, grace* and free will, and *election;* with which were connected, those of infant baptism, redemption, and perseverance in holiness.

Notices. The *earlier writings of Augustine* were: de Libero Arbitrio, Lib. III. A. D. 388. de Diversis Questionibus LXXXIII. A. D. 348—395. de Diversis Questionibus ad Simplicianum, A. D. 397. *His later writings* were: de Peccatorum meritis et remissione, Lib. III. A. D. 412. de Natura et gratia, contra Pelagium, A. D. 415. de Gestis Pelagii, A. D. 416. de Gratia Christi, et de peccato originali, Lib. II. A. D. 418. de Nuptiis et concupiscentia, Lib. I, II. A.D. 419, 420. contra II. Epistolas Pelagianorum, ad Bonafacium, Lib. IV. and contra Julianum. Lib. VI. A. D. 421. de Correptione et gratia; de Gratia et libero Arbitrio, A. D. 427. de Praedestinatione sanctorum; de Dono perseverantiae, A. D. 428, or 429. Operis imperfecti contra Julianum, Lib. VI. A. D. 430.

From *Pelagius*, we have, besides a commentary on the Epistles of Paul, an Epistle to Demetrias, (edited by J. S. Semler, Halle, 1775.) and a confession of faith. From *Coelestius*, also a confession of faith. And from *Julian*, many fragments, cited by Augustine.

Sec. 92. *The first point, sin.*

The *Pelagians* believed, that Adam's sin had no bad effects, upon the character and condition of his posterity; that sin arose, merely, from imitation; that all men are, from their nature, mortal; and are born, undepraved. According to *Augustine's* doctrine, all men, in consequence of their descent from Adam, are mortal; are chargeable with hereditary sin; and are obnoxious to damnation. These doctrines he endeavored to prove, from infant baptism, from the practice of exorcisms, and from Rom. v. 12. Against him it was objected, that his doctrine of hereditary sin and its propagation, was ab-

surd; that it would lead to the disapproval of matrimony; and that, affirming the corruption of human nature, and a connate worthiness of punishment, was making God the author of evil, and an unrighteous judge.

Sec. 93. *Second point, grace and free will.*

Desirous of explaining, precisely, the activity of man, and the influences of God, *Pelagius* discriminated between the *power*, the *will*, and the *act;* and he attributed the first to God, the second to man, and the third to both united. [When a man *wills* to do good, God gives him the *power*, and so both have a part in the *act.*] By the ambiguous term *grace*, he understood, sometimes, divine instructions, and sometimes, other means of moral improvement; but never, any divine energy that impaired the free operations of the will. *Augustine*, on the contrary, subverted, substantially at least, the freedom of the will; and derived all that was good in man, solely from divine *grace;* by which he understood an internal operation upon the soul, whereby it received, not only the *power*, but also the *will*, to do good. This grace, he maintained to be indispensable to man, at all times, and for all duties: without it, no man can do a good act; and even with it, no man is entirely free from sin. All this he inferred either from his idea of hereditary sin, or from such passages of Scripture as John viii. 31, 32. Phil. ii. 13. 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6. But he exposed himself to the objection, that, like the Manichaeans, he annihilated the freedom of the will, and must look upon all precepts and exhortations to virtue as nugatory.

Sec. 94. *Third point, election.*

From his conviction, that all men are totally depraved, and incapable of good deeds, there was no way left, for *Augustine* to answer the question, Why are some converted and saved, and others not,—but to ascribe it to the sovereign will of God. And thus was formed, his doctrine of *unconditional predestination;* according to which, God destined some men to blessedness, without

regard to their merits and conduct, from his mere good pleasure; while he leaves others in their sins, and sentences them to punishment, in order to exhibit his justice. These doctrines not only forced themselves upon him, as consequences of the other parts of his system; but he believed, they could be established by the scripture, Rom. ix: and he took great pains to soften down their harsh features, and to meet the objections to their injurious practical tendency. From them flowed, spontaneously, the ideas of irresistible divine influences, of special grace, and particular redemption, and of the infallible perseverance of the elect.

Sec. 95. *Progress of the doctrine, after Augustine.*

Great as the influence of Augustine was, his principles gained no currency, among the Eastern christians; and even in the West, opposition was raised; especially by the Gallican divines, who believed that, men still have some ability to do good, by means of which, though they cannot *merit* divine grace, yet they can *prepare* themselves to receive it; and that God's purpose to save, depends on the foreseen use made of this power. *John Cassianus* was the most noted divine of this party; and *Faustus*, Bishop of Riez, brought *Lucidus* an Augustinian, to change his sentiments, A. D. 475. The controversy between the *Massilians*, (Semi-Pelagians,) and those called *Predestinarians*, continued for some time; but in the year 529, the opinions of the former were condemned, in the Councils of Arausio (Orange) and Valentia (Valence;) and the decision was confirmed by the Romish Bishops.

References. Jo. Cassianus, Collationes patrum Sceticorum, Collat. XIII. Opp. p. 591—627.

Prosper of Aquitain, de Gratia et Arbitrio Liber, contra Collatorem; in Opp. *Cassian.* p. 887.

Faustus, Ep. ad Lucidum: and, de Gratia et libero Arbitrio Lib. II.—in Biblioth Patr.

Praedestinatus; in Opp. *J. Sirmondi*, Tom. I.

Sec. 96. *What Christ has done for mankind.*

Historians. *J. Fr. Cotta*, Dissertatio, historiam doctrinae de Redemptione ecclesiae sanguine J. C. factâ exhibens; in *Jo. Gerhardi* Locis theolog. ed. *Cotta*, Tom. IV. p. 105. *Wern. Car. Lud. Ziegler*, Historia dogmatis de Redemptione, seu de modis, quibus redemptio Christi explicabatur; Gotting. 1791.—also in *Velthusen*, *Kühnöl* et *Ruperti*, Commentatt. Theolog. vol. V. p. 227 &c.

The doctrines concerning sin and grace, stand closely connected with those concerning Christ; for it is through him, that sins are blotted out, and the grace of God imparted. Jesus Christ was described, as being, in various respects, the greatest benefactor of mankind; and for proof, mention was made of his excellent instructions, his noble example, the communication of powers for holiness, his overthrowing the dominion of evil spirits, and procuring immortality. At the same time, as *Irenaeus*(1), and even *Gregory* of Nazianzum, assert, the theologians were left free, to form their own conceptions of the design and effects of the incarnation and sufferings of Christ: and it is not strange, therefore, that we should find them to have entertained different views.

(1) adv. Haeres. I. c. 10.

Sec. 97. *Effects of Christ's death.*

Both *Irenaeus*(1) and *Origen*(2) had, in their day, represented the death of Christ, sometimes, as *a ransom given* to the devil, and sometimes, as *a debt paid* to God. In accordance with the first of these hypotheses, most of the fathers spoke of the death of Christ, as being the means of the rescue of mankind from the dominion of the devil, under which sin had brought them: and they sometimes go upon the assumption, that on the principle of distributive justice, the power of the devil was taken from him, because he misused it upon Jesus Christ(3); at other times, they represent redemption as being, either *a combat*(4), or *a bargain*(5), with the devil. *Gregory* of

Nazianzum, however, rejects the idea, that Jesus Christ paid a ransom to *the devil*(6). Others of the fathers,—as *Athanasius*(7) and *Cyril*(8),—go upon the principle of *a debt paid* to God; and they consider the death of Christ, as the *stipulated condition*, on which God can, without injury to his veracity, release men from the death threatened to them. Some of them also assert, that Jesus Christ paid more, than was necessary for the redemption of the human race(9). Lastly, there were some, who supposed, that the whole *mass* of human nature, was elevated and ennobled, by the Son of God's participating in it(10). It remained undetermined, whether the death of Christ was *indispensable*, in order to the salvation of men(11). Respecting the *extent* of redemption, *Origen*(12) advanced the idea, that Christ died, not merely for men, but for all intelligent creatures: but this idea was, by all the other fathers, except perhaps *Gregory*(13) of Nyssa and *Didymus*(14), either silently rejected, or expressly disapproved.

(1) adv. Haeres. Lib. V. c. 1, 16, 21.

(2) Comment. in Matth. Opp. T. III. p. 726, and p. 321. and T. IV. p. 495. Homil. VI. in Exod. Lib. II. contra Cels. Lib. I. § 31.

(3) *Augustine*, de Lib. Arbitrio. Lib. III. c. 10. (Opp. T. I. p. 622 &c.) also de Trinit. Lib. XIII. c. 10—15. *Chrysostom*, Homil. LXVI. (T. VIII. p. 432, 433.) Homil. XXIV. in 1 Ep. ad Cor. (T. XI. p. 262.)—*Hilary* of Poict. Tract. in Ps. lxviii. § 8. p. 218.—*Leo* the Gr. Serm. LIX. c.4. (Tom. I. p. 132. ed. Quesn.) Serm. LXVII. c.3. p.145.—*Gregory* the Gr. Moral. Lib.XVII.

(4) *Irenaeus*, adv. Haer. V. c. 21, § 3.—*Origen*, contra Cels. Lib. I. § 31.—*Theodoret*, de Provident. Orat. X. (Opp. T. IV. p. 660.)—*Hilary* Pictav. Comment. in Matth. c. 3. § 1, 5. p. 618, 620.—*Leo* the Gr. Orat. XXII. (Opp. I. p. 72.)—*Gregory* the Gr. Moral. Lib. XXVI. c. 18.

(5) *Irenaeus*, adv. Haeres. V. c. 1.—*Origen*, Comment. in Matth. (Opp. T. III. p. 726.)—*Basil* the Gr. Homil. in

Ps. xlviii. (Opp. I. p. 179 &c.)—*Jerome* in Ep. ad. Ephes. cap. I. (Opp. IX. p. 263.)—*Ambrose* Epp. Lib. IX. Ep. 77.—*Rufinus*, Expos. Symb. Apostol. (sub Opp. Cypr. p.21, 22. ed. Brem.) That the devil was overreached, say: *Cyril* of Jerus. Catechet. XII. p. 170. and *Gregory* Nyss. Orat. catechet. c. 22—26.

(6) *Gregory* Nazianz. Orat. XLII. (Opp. T. I. p. 691,692.) and the author of the Dialogue, de Recta fide, sec. 1. inter Opp. *Origenis*, T. I. p. 820.

(7) de Incarnat. (Opp. T. I. p. 60–62, or p. 52 &c. ed. Montf.) Orat. III. (II.) in Arianos, (T. I. p. 439, 440, or p. 535 &c. ed. Montf.)

(8) Catech. XIII. § 33.

(9) *Cyril* of Jerus. Catech. XIII. § 33.

(10) *Gregory* Nyss. Orat. Catech. c. 16, 32, 37. and Opp. Tom. II. p. 17, 588. Tom. III. p. 72, 73, 92, 102.—*Hilary* Pictav. de Trinitit. Lib. II. § 24, 25. and in Ps. li. § 15.

(11) Affirmed by: *Basil* the Gr. Homil. in Ps. xlviii. (Opp. I. 179, 180.)—*Cyril* Alex. Dial. de incarnatione unigeniti, (Opp. V. p. 684.)—*Leo* the Gr. Serm. L. c. 1, 2. Denied by: *Athanasius*, Orat. III. (II.) in Arian. (Opp. I. p. 438, 439.)—*Gregory* Naz. Orat. IX. p. 157.—*Gregory* Nyss. Orat. catechet, c. 17.—*Theodoret*, de graecar. affectt. Curatione, Lib. VI. (Opp. IV. p. 875, 876.)—*Cyril* Alex. contra Jul. Lib. VIII. p. 284, 285. *Augustine*, de Agone Christi. c. 11. and de Trinit. Lib. XIII. c. 10.

(12) Comment. in Joh. (Opp. T. IV. p. 41, 42.) contra Cels. Lib. II. p. 409. Lib. VII. p. 706.

(13) Orat. Catechet. c. 26.

(14) Enarrat. in I. Ep. Petri; in *Gallandi* Biblioth. Patr. VI. p. 293.—That Christ suffered *in our stead*, was taught by: *Eusebius*, Demonstrat. Evang. Lib. X. p. 467, and Lib. I. p. 38.—*Gregory* Nizanz. Orat. XXXVI. p. 580, and *Cyril* Alexand. de recta fide ad Reginas, Opp. Tom. V. p. 131.

Sec. 98. *Forgiveness of sin.*

It was universally admitted, that men obtain forgiveness of sin, through Jesus Christ. But a distinction

was carefully made, between sins *before* baptism, and sins committed *afterwards*. The former, it was believed, were wholly removed, by Christ, in baptism. But for subsequent sins, the man himself must make satisfaction(1). This satisfaction consisted in *Penance*, or voluntary self-inflictions; (which were considered as punishments, that the person laid upon himself, in order to escape divine punishment;) and in *good works*, among which, fasting, prayer, and alms-giving, were especially recommended. Also the *intercessions* of living christians, and of glorified saints, were supposed to contribute very efficiently, to the forgiveness of these sins. Whether, after one penance, a second penance could be admitted, and whether it was possible, to do penance in the last moments of life, there was not entire agreement; but the majority answered affirmatively. ***Faith*** was considered, as the general requisite, to a participation of the blessings of christianity. By faith, was understood, embracing the christian religion, or rather, orthodoxy. But the necessity of uniting good works with faith, was strongly urged; and the nature of good works,—which must originate from faith, and derive all their value from it,—was the most precisely explained by Augustine. At the same time, the opinion was more and more distinctly held, that a man could perform more, than he was properly required to do, (works of superogation,) and thereby attain to higher perfection and recompense(2). The word *justification*, (justificatio,) was oftener used for sanctification(3), than for the pardon of sin.

Reference. Historia antiquior dogmatis de modo salutis tenendae, et justificationis seu veniae peccatorum a Deo impetrandae instrumentis;—auctore *Henr. Leonh. Heubner.* Part I. and II. Wittemb. 1805. 4to.

(1) *Clemens* Alex. Strom. Lib. IV. p. 634. *Origen*, in Ep. ad Rom. Lib. III. p. 516, 517. *Cyprian*, de opere et eleem. p. 197. *Cyril* Jerus. Catech. XVIII. sec. 20. *Chrysostom*, in Evan. Joan. Homil. LXXII. (Tom. VIII.

p. 466.) *Augustine*, Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 70, 71. de Fide et opp. c. 19.
(2) *Hermas*, Similit. V. c. 2, 3.
(3) *Augustine*, Ep. CXL. sec. 53.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS.

Sec. 99. *Baptism.*

Historian. History of Baptism and the Anabaptists, (in German,) by *J. A. Stark*, Lips. 1785. 8vo.

The earliest description of baptism among Christians, is given by *Justin Martyr*(1). The fathers, very early, ascribed to this act a peculiar efficacy, in the forgiveness of sins, and in the sanctification of the soul: and there was a continued advance in the degree of efficacy ascribed to it. Ordinarily, baptism was administered by immersion(2), and only to the sick, by sprinkling; and it was regarded, as necessary to salvation(4), unless it was compensated by a bloody baptism i. e. martyrdom(5). With baptism, it was common to join exorcism and unction.

Note. Singular idea of some fathers, concerning baptism performed in the lower world.(6)
(1) Apol. maj. p. 79, 80.
(2) *Barnabas*, Ep. c. 3. *Theoph.* ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 361. *Clemens* Alex. Strom. I. c. 6 &c. *Tertullian*, de Baptismo. c. 4, 5, 6, 15. *Basil* the Gr. Homil. de Baptismo. (Opp. T. II.) *Gregory* Nyss. de Baptismo Christi. (Opp. T. III.) *Cyril* Jerus. Catech. I. c. 3. III. c. 11, 15. XVII. c. 37. XX. c. 6. *Gregory* Naz. Orat. XL. *Augustine*, Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 43, 64.
(3) *Turtullian*, adv. Prax. c. 26. *Irenaeus*, adv. Haer. I. c. 18. *Basil* the Gr. de Spir.S. c. 27.—Sprinkling used: *Cyprian*, Ep. 69, ad Magnum, p. 185 &c.
(4) *Irenaeus*, adv. Haer. III. c. 17. *Origen*, Exhort. ad Martyr. sec. 30. *Tertullian* de Baptismo, c. 12, 13.

Augustine de Peccator. meritis et remiss. Lib. III. c. 3—5, and c. 12, 13. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 43.

(5) *Origen*, Exhort. ad Martyr. sec. 30. *Tertull.* de Bapt. c. 16. *Cyprian*, Ep. 73.

(6) *Clemens* Alex. Strom. Lib. II. p. 452, and VI. p. 762, 763.

Sec. 100. *Infant Baptism.*

All the earlier traces of infant baptism, are very undecisive; and *Tertullian*(1) is the first who mentions it, to disapprove of it. On the contrary, *Origen* (2) and *Cyprian* (3) patronize it. In the fourth century, its legality was universally admitted (4), notwithstanding the fathers often found occasion, to warn christians against delaying it; and even *Pelagius* (5) did not dare to question its correctness. *Augustine* (6) assigned to it the distinct object, to take away the innate sin, and guilt of the child: and by his views of it, the general practice of it was promoted.

Historians. Wm. Wall, History of Infant Baptism; Lond. 1705. 2 vol. 8vo.

J. G. Walch, Historia Paedobaptismi IV. priorum saeculor;—in his Miscell. Sacra. 1744.

David Rees, Infant Baptism no institution of Christ; and the rejection of it, justified from Scripture and antiquity; Lond. 1734. 8vo.

Robert Robinson, The history of Baptism:—abridged by *D. Benedict.* Boston 1817. 8vo.

(1) de Baptismo. c. 18.

(2) in Levit. Homil. VIII. (Opp. T. II. p. 230.) in Ev. Lu. Homil. xv. Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. Lib. v. (Opp. T. iv. p. 565.)

(3) Ep. ad Fidum. p. 158.

(4) *Gregory* Naz. Orat. xl. *Gregory* Nyss. de Infantibus, qui praemature abripiuntur. (Opp. T. III.) *Augustine*, de Genesi ad Literam. Lib. x. c. 23. &c. &c.

(5) Professio Fidei.

(6) Ep. CLVII. sec 11. Ep. XCVIII. Ep. CLXXXVII. sec. 22 &c. de Genesi ad Lit. Lib. x. c. 23. de Peccator. meritis et remiss. Lib. I. c. 26.

Sec. 101. *Heretical baptisms.*

Much longer, continued the doubt, whether those who were baptized by heretics, had received valid baptism. The African churches were convinced, that true baptism existed only in the Catholic church. In this, they differed from the Romish church; and the bishops, *Stephen* and *Cyprian*, had a controversy on the subject. Even the decrees of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, did not produce uniformity of sentiment. The Catholics of Africa, were led by the Donatist controversy, to depart from their former principles. *Augustine* devised the doctrine, that the validity of baptism depends, not on the orthodoxy of the church in which, or of the person by whom, it is administered, but solely on the invocation of the Trinity; yet that baptism can conduct to salvation, only those that belong to the true church. This doctrine, he labored to establish, yet with the greatest tenderness for the reputation of Cyprian.

References. *Cyprian*, Epistolae LXIX—LXXV.—*Augustine*, de baptismo, contra Donatistas, Libri VI.

Sec. 102. *The Lord's Supper.*

Historians. De Eucharistiae sacramento, Lib. III; authore *Edm. Albertin;* Daventr. 1654. Fol.

Histoire de l'Eucharistie; par *Matth. de Larroque*, Amst. 1671. 8vo.

Rudolph Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria; Genev. 1681. II. vol. Fol.

J. Aug. Ernesti, Antimuratorius; Lips. 1755. and in his Opusc. Theol. Lips. 1792.

History of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper: (in German,) in *Cramer's* Continuation of Bonnet's Introduction to the History of the world and of religion, vol. V. P. II.

La perpetuité de l' église catholique touchant l' Eucharistie; Paris 1670—74. III. vol. with volumes IV. and V. (by

Euseb. Renaudot,) Paris 1711, 1713. 4to. and the writings in reply, by *J. Claude.*

The Lord's supper (εὐχαρϛια, σύναξις ἐυλογια. *missa*) was solemnized by christians, after the example of Christ, and as a memorial of him. After the second century, it was likened to the pagan mysteries, and was kept from the sight of all unbaptized persons. In it, common bread was used, and the wine was mixed with water. The custom of some heretical sects, of witholding the cup, or of presenting water instead of wine, was disapproved. Baptized children(1) were allowed to partake of the Lord's supper. The zeal of the fathers led them to exhibit, under the strongest imagery, this transaction as very holy, very efficacious, and very awful.

(1) *Cyprian.* de Lapsis, p. 132.

Sec. 103. *The Lord's Supper as a sacrifice.*

According to the concordant decisions of the ancient fathers, the Lord's supper is to be considered, as a *sacrifice* (θυσια, προσφορα, oblatio, sacrificium.) Yet Justin(1) and Irenaeus(2) make it to be only a *thank-offering.* The African fathers, Tertullian(3) and Cyprian(4), speak of offerings *for the dead;* and the latter represents the Lord's supper, as being an act of the priest, in which he, in Christ's stead, presents bread and wine to God, in *imitation* of the sacrifice of Christ. In the fourth century, the Lord's supper was universally considered, as an unbloody sacrifice; whereby the accompanying prayers of the living and the dead, obtained peculiar efficacy, and were potent to the averting of all sorts of evils. The idea, that the Lord's supper was a *memorial* of the sacrifice of Christ, was gradually supplanted by another, that it was a *repetition* of that sacrifice; and the doctrine of *purgatory* being introduced, the idea of the *sacrifice of the Mass*, grew up in the Latin church.

(1) Apolog. maj. p. 82, 83. (p. 98. ed. Col.) Dial. p. 209, 210.

(2) adv. Haeres. Lib. IV. c. 17, 18.
(3) de Corona, c. 3. de Monogam. c. 10.
(4) Epist. LXIII. p. 149, 155.

Reference. Essay of a History of the doctrine of a sacrifice in the Lord's supper; (German,) in the Göttingenchen Bibliothek der neuesten theol. Literatur, vol. II. p. 159, and 317.

Sec. 104. *Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.*

As all christians considered the Lord's supper, to be a means of *communion with Christ*, two modes of explaining this communion early appeared. Some, as *Tertullian*(1) *Origen*(2) and *Cyprian*(3), regarded the bread and wine, as *mere symbols* of the body and blood of Jesus. Others, as *Justin*(4) and *Irenaeus*(5) (though with very indistinct conceptions,) supposed that, the Logos united himself with the bread and wine, and thus *transformed* them into his body and blood, and into food, that imparted immortality to the body of the partaker of it. Although this diversity of sentiment, did not afterwards disappear, yet subsequent to the fourth century, the latter hypothesis acquired an ascendency, more and more manifest; and it became common, to speak of the *transformation* of the elements, although the church had not yet an established belief on the subject.

(1) *Tertullian*, contra Marcion, Lib. IV. c. 40.
(2) Comment. in Matth. Opp. T. III. p. 498—500
(3) Ep. LXIII. p. 148 &c. 153 &c.
(4) Apolog. maj. p. 82, 83.
(5) adv. Haer. V. c. 2.

Reference. *Phil. Marheineke*, Sanc. Patrum de praesentia Christi in coena Domini sententia triplex; s. sacrae Eucharistiae historia tripartita; Heidelb. 1811. 4to.

Sec. 105. *Of the sacraments in general.*

The word *sacrament* (sacramentum, in Gr. μυστηριον) was sometimes used for religious doctrines, that transcend the comprehension of men, and sometimes for religious rites. Among these rites, baptism and the Lord's sup-

per held the first rank; and they were described as means, by which God imparts his grace to men. *Unction*, however, was distinguished from baptism; and *Augustine*(1) added the two institutions of *ordination* and *marriage*. The pseudo-*Dionosius* Areopagita(2) enumerates *six* sacraments; namely baptism, the Lord's supper, unction, ordination, monastic vows, and religious rites on the dead.

(1) contra Ep. Parmeniani Lib. II. c. 12. Sec. 28. de Bono conjugali, c. 7. et 15.

(2) *Dionys. Areop.* de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, Opp. T. I. p. 229.

SECOND PERIOD.

THE MIDDLE AGES, A. D. 600—1517.

PART I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE STATE OF THEOLOGY.

Sec. 106. *State of theology among the Greeks, at the beginning of the period.*

The state of the Greek empire, which, in consequence of enemies without and bad management within, was threatened with dissolution, raised obstructions to the progress of theology. But still greater obstacles lay in the theological disposition of the age; which was governed by authority, looked at the bible through the glass of the earlier expositors, compiled systems of faith from the works of preceding times, and was violently passionate against heretics. The contests concerning the *wills* of Christ, and concerning *pictures* in churches, called forth indeed the activity of theologians, but gave no favorable direction to their minds.

Sec. 107. *John Damascenus.*

From the materials, which the various controversies of the preceding ages and the industry of the fathers had accumulated, *John* of *Damascus* formed an orthodox system of divinity (ἐκθεσις ἀκριβης της ὀρθοδοξου πιστεως); which was received with great applause, on account of the uncommon learning of the author, and his reputation earned in the field of orthodox warfare. Although we are not to look there, for natural interpretations of scripture, and candid investigations of subjects; yet the work commends itself, by a happy selection of thoughts

from approved writers, by clearness of expression, and by the attempt to give, with the aid of the Aristotelian philosophy, new confirmations and greater unity to the received theology.

References. *Io. Damasceni* Opp. cura *Mich. Le Quien.* Paris, 1712. II. vol. Fol. Epitome universae theologiae; s. Explicatio IV. libror. Damasceni Chrysorrhoae, de orthodoxa fide; auctore *Christoph Pelargo;* Francf. 1605. 4to. *Rösler's* Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, vol. VIII. p. 248—532.

Sec. 108. *Greek theology subsequently.*

After John Damascen, the cultivation of theology, among the Greeks, still declined: and, was directed solely, to the prosecution of the contest respecting image-worship; to the attacking of manichaeism, as revived by the Paulicians; and to the points of doctrine, contested between the Greeks and the Latins. Those inclined to attempt something more, as *Euthymius Zigabenus* (d. circ. A. D. 1116) and *Nicetas Choniates*, compiled collections of sentences from the fathers, against the heretics. The detached parties, the Nestorians (Chaldaic christians,) and the Monophysites, (Jacobites,) had for dogmatic writers—the former, *Ebed Jesu* (d. 1318) and the latter, *Jacobus* of Tagrit (d. 1231) and *Abulfaradsch* (d. 1286.)

Notices. *Euthymii Zigabeni,* πανοπλια δογματικη της ὀρθοδοξου πιστεως published, Lat. in the Biblioth. maxima Patrum, T. XIX. and Gr. Targov. 1710. Fol. *Nicetae Choniatis* θησαυρος ὀρθοδοξιας. See *Bandini* Eccles. Graecae Monum. T. II. p. 1 & c. *Ebed Jesu* Margarita; s. de vera Fide. See *Assemanni* Biblioth. Orient. Tom. III. P. I. *Jacobus Tagrit.* Liber Thesaurorum. See Asseman l. c. T. II. p. 237. *Abulfaragii* candelabrum sanctorum de fundamentis ecclesiae. Ibid. p. 284.

Sec. 109. *State of theology among the Latins.*

In the newly erected western kingdoms, learning sunk faster and deeper, than it did in the East; yet here also,

the like firm adherence to the earlier systems of belief, prevailed. The Romish Bishops distinguished themselves, by their zeal against the Monothelites, and the opposers of image worship. *Isidore* of Seville, is little more than an undiscriminating compiler of sentences from the works of Augustine and Gregory. *Tajo* of Saragossa, and *Ildefonsus* of Toledo, made similar compilations.

Notices. Isidori Hispalensis Opp. Madrid, 1778. II. vol. Fol. and by *F. Arevalo*, Romae, 1797—1803. VII. vol. 4to. In which are, Sententiarum Libri III. Also his Etymologies. Lib. VII. and VIII. contain explanations of many points in theology.

Tajonis Caesaraugustani Sententiarum Lib. V.

Ildefonsi Toletani Annotatt. de cognitione baptismi, Liber; in *Steph. Baluzii* Miscellanea, T. VI. p. 1. Paris, 1713.

Sec. 110. *Age of Charlemagne.*

In the empire of the Franks, Charlemagne awakened the slumbering love of science. He and his assistants—among whom *Alcuin* was prominent—exercised their ingenuity, in applying the theology of the fathers to the controversies respecting image worship, and with the Adoptionists. In the schools established by Charlemagne, various learned men were trained, who became conspicuous, by their investigations concerning the Lord's Supper, and the doctrine of election. Yet one individual, *John Scotus*, distinguished himself among his contemporaries, by his uncommon boldness of thought. He also transplanted the writings of the supposed *Dionysius Areopagita*, into the soil of the Latin churches.

Notices. Flaccus Alcuinus, Opp.—cura J. Frobenii; Ratisbon. 1777. II. Tom. IV. vol. Fol.

Jo Scotus, de Divisione naturae, Lib. V. Oxon. 1609.

Hincmarus Rhemensis, Opp.—cura *Ja. Sirmondi;* Paris 1645. II. Vol. Fol.

Sec. 111. *Preparatory steps to Scholastic theology.*

Historians. Important materials, for a history of scholastic

theology, are contained in the Histoire literaire de la France, (yet reaching only to the 12th century,) and in the Historia universitatis Parisiensis, authore *Caes. Egas. Bulaeo.* Paris 1665—73. VI. vol. Fol.—The history itself is best given by,

Ad. Tribbechovius, de Doctoribus scholasticis, cum Praef. Libro. *C. A. Heumann*, Jena. 1719.

J. A. Cramer, Continuation of *Bossuet's* General History; (in German,) vol. V. VI. VII.

J. M. Schroeckh, History of the Christian Church; (in German,) vol. XXV—XXXIV.

Its history, philosophically considered, is best given by,

Brucker, Historia critica Philosophiae; Tom. III.

Tiedemann, The Spirit of speculative Philosophy; (in German,) Vol. IV. and V.

Eberstein, Natural Theology of the Scholastics; (in German,) Lips. 1803.

Tennemann, History of Philosophy; (in German,) vol. VIII.

The activity, which Charlemagne had imparted to the study of theology, disappeared, so early as the ninth century; and was seen no more, till the last half of the eleventh century, when dialectics was again prosecuted, with impassioned ardour, and *Roscelin* shewed himself at the head of the Nominalists. The schools in France, then flourished again; and the cathedral school of Tours, awakened emulation in the monastic school of Le Bec. The controversy respecting the Lord's Supper, carried on by *Lanfrank* (d. 1088), against *Berengarius* (d. 1080), in which philosophical argumentation was employed, called forth close thinking, and gave new activity to the speculative powers.

Notices. Berengarius Turonensis, or Announcement of one of his important works; (in German,) by *Gott. Eph. Lessing;* Brunsw. 1770.—Berengarius Turonensis; by *C. F. Stäudlin;* in his and *H. G. Tzschirner's* Archiv

für alte und neue Kirchengeschichte, vol. II. P. 1. p. 1 &c.

Lanfranci Cantuariensis Opera ; evulgavit *Lucas Dacherius*. Paris 1648. Fol.

Sec. 112. *Anselm and Hildebert.*

The proper commencement of scholastic theology, or of attempts to establish the received doctrines of faith on philosophic principles, is to be ascribed to *Anselm* of Canterbury (d. 1109); who attempted to raise many articles of the received faith, to the rank of demonstrative truths. *Hildebert* (a Lavardino, Ep. Cenomanensis, and then) Archbishop of Tours (d. 1132), in his Tractatus Theologicus, embraced most of the theological tenets then discussed, in one connected discourse. About this time, in addition to the existing schools, larger seminaries of learning began to be erected, which spread wider this philosophizing theology; in which, the university of Paris took the lead, through the whole of the middle ages.

Notices. Anselmi Cantuariensis Opera ;—cura *Gabr. Gerberon.* ed. 2. Paris 1721. Fol.

Hildeberti Opera; cura *Ant. Beaugendre*; Paris 1708. Fol.

Sec. 113. *Contest respecting philosophic theology.*

This new shape of theology would, in various respects, naturally appear suspicious, in the eyes of those habituated to the old mode of teaching, or the Theologi Positivi. Also the ecclesiastical hierarchy, over which the Popes had elevated themselves to unlimited power, could not be indifferent to this freedom of thought; and especially, as even at that very time, they saw their rights assailed, by the new sects that were rising up. Anselm and Hildebert, indeed, in consequence of their high respectability, and their prudence, had no collision with the church. But the higher daring of their successors, met with restraints. The open hearted *Peter Abelard* (d. 1142) was subdued, by the great influence of *St. Ber-*

nard of Clairvaux (d. 1153); and *Gilbert* of Porretta (d. 1154) met with—not indeed the same—but a similar fate.

Notices. Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, qui ab initio seculi XII.—in ecclesia proscripti sunt;—opera *Car. du Plessis d' Argeutré;* Paris 1728—36. III. Vol. Fol.

Pet. Abaelardi Opera;— cura *Andr Quercetani;* Paris 1616. 4to.—Theologiae christianae Lib. V. in *Edm. Martene's* Thesaur. Anecdotorum. Tom. V. p. 1139.—*F. C. Schlosser,* Abaelard und Dulcin; (in German,) Gotha 1807. 8vo.

Sec. 114. *Further advances of scholastic theology.*

Warned by the example of Abelard, some of his contemporaries carefully avoided offending the church. *Robert Pulleyn* (d. about 1153) even became a Cardinal; and *Hugo* of S. Victor (d. 1164) enjoyed the friendship of St. Bernard. *Richard* of St. Victor (d. 1173) labored to explain and confirm mystic theology, by metaphysical philosophy. *Robert* of Melun (d. 1173) and *Alan* of Ryssel (ab Insulis, d. 1203) wrote compilations of philosophical views in theology; and the latter distinguished himself, by attempting to support all doctrines of faith, with mathematical demonstrations. But *Peter Lombard* (d. 1164) eclipsed all his predecessors. His work, which is a compilation and comparison of the opinions of all the earlier theologians, obtained universal respect. He was indeed, together with his pupil *Peter* of Poictiers (d. 1206), accused of many errors; and *Walter* of St. Victor represented him as one of the corrupters of France: yet his book triumphed over all its enemies, so as even to claim to be free from plagiarism.

Notices. Roberti Pulli Sententiarum Lib. VIII. et Petri Petaviensis Sententiarum Lib. V.—studio *Hugonis Mathoud;* Paris 1655. Fol.

Hugonis a St. Victore, de Sacramentis ecclesiae, Lib. II.—in his Opp. Rothomagi 1648. Fol.

Richardi a St. Victore Opp. Rothom. 1650. Fol.

Extracts from the unpublished writings of *Robert* of Meluns, are in *Bulaei* Hist. Univer. Paris. Tom. II. p. 585—626.

Alani ab Insulis, Libri V. de Arte; s. de articulis catholicae fidei;—in *Pezii* Thesaurus Anecdot. T. I. P. II. p. 475, &c.

Petri Lombardi Sententiarum Lib. IV.—often published; e. g. Louv. 1553. Fol. Colon. 1576. 8vo.—(*Lamberti Danaei* Prolegomena in Librum primum Sententiarum Lombardi;—in his Opuscula Theol. Genev. 1583. Fol.)—*Bandini* Sententiarum theologicarum Lib. IV. Viennae 1519. Fol.

Sec. 115. *Influence of the monastic orders on the scholastic theology.*

Since the time of Innocent III. (A. D. 1198,) the Popes assumed the freer use of legislative power in matters of faith, and were more active in suppressing all opinions that displeased them. The then recent orders of Dominicans and Franciscans, forced their way into the theological chairs, outshone the other doctors, and imparted to theology something of the spirit of their orders. To them it belonged, to combine the Aristotelian philosophy with strict orthodoxy, and thus reconcile the church to that philosophy. *Alexander* of Hales (d. 1245) and *Albert* the Great, the most learned of all the scholastics, led the way. *Thomas Aquinas* (d. 1274) excelled all that preceded him, in acuteness, and in the multitude of theological questions, which he discussed. His contemporary, *John Bonaventure* (d. 1274), was not so penetrating; but he endeavored to give nutriment, not only to the understanding, but to the imagination and the heart of the reader. *John Duns Scotus* (d. 1308), the most subtle and the most obscure of all the doctors of that age, differed from Thomas Aquinas on many points, and formed a distinct school. The *Thomists* and the *Scotists* lived in continual warfare with each other.

Notices. *Alexandri Halesii* Summa universae theologiae; Colon. 1576. Fol.

Alberti Magni Opera; cura *Petri Jammi;* Lugd. 1651. XXI Vol. Fol.—Of which; Commentarii in Libros IV. Sententiarum, Bas. 1506 IV vol.—Summa theologica, P. I. et II. Bas. 1507. II vol. Fol.

Thomae Aquinatis Opera; Rom. 1572. XVII vol. Fol.—Venet 1745 &c. XX vol. Fol.—Of which; Commentarii in Libros Sententiarum; (often printed e. g.) Paris 1659. IV vol. Fol.—Summae totius theologiae Lib. III. Antw. 1624. Fol. (The genuineness of this Summa, was contested by *Jo. Launoy;* but defended by *Natalis Alexander,* in an appropriate Essay; Historia Eccles. Saecul. XIII. et XIV. Tom. VII. p. 391.)

Joannis Bonaventurae Opera; Romae 1588—96. VIII. Vol. Fol.—Of which: Commentarii in Libros IV. Sententiarum, Centiloquium Lib. IV. Priviloquium Lib. VII.

Jo. Duns Scoti Opera; curante *Luc. Wadding;* Lugd. 1639. XII. Vol. Fol. Of which: Quodlibeta, et Commentarii in IV. Sententiarum Libros. Venet. 1616. IV. Vol. Fol.—Opus Parisiense; Antw. 1620.—Qnaestiones quodlibetariae; Antw. 1620. Fol.

Sec. 116. *The later scholastics.*

After these men, the study of philosophic theology was indeed pursued with industry and eagerness, but it degenerated into servile imitation, or useless puzzling. Yet there were some, who rose above their contemporaries. *Durand* of St. Poursain (d. 1333), although a Dominican, dared to contradict St. Thomas. *William Occam* (d. 1347) boldly deviated from Scotus; and even withstood, spiritedly, the Pope. *Raymund* de Sabunde (d. about 1526) was the first, who treated of natural theology, in an appropriate work. *Gabriel Biel* (d. 1496) was the last of the distinguished scholastics of this period.

Notices. *Gulielmi Durandi* de Sancto Porciano, Commentaria in IV. Libros Sententiarum; Paris 1515. Fol.

Gulielmi Occam, Quaestiones in Libros IV. Sententiarum;

Lugd. 1495. Fol.—Ejusdem, Centiloquium theologicum; Lugd. 1496. Fol.

Theologia naturalis, s. Liber creaturarum; authore *Raymundo de Sabunde;* Francf. 1635.

Gabrielis Biel, Collectorium in Libros IV. Sententiarum; Tubing. 1502. II. vol. Fol.

SEC. 117. *Causes of the downfall of scholastic theology.*

The foundations of this theology were tottering; and the modes of proceeding in it, brought the germ of its dissolution along with them. They sought to exercise their own powers of investigation, and yet to leave the influence of the fathers untouched, and to construe the Bible only as they did. Unlike, as the theology of the fathers and the Aristoletian philosophy *were*, both in spirit and in first principles; an attempt was made, to unite them. This constitutional debility of the scholastic system, was the sooner shaken, in consequence of other causes. Many christians were disgusted with precepts, which merely exercised, or rather puzzled the understanding, with superfine speculations, and gave no nutriment to the soul; and this disgust was increased, by the disagreeable contests between the Thomists and the Scotists. *John Charlier Gerson* (d. 1320), *Nicholas de Clemangis*, and other discerning men, animadverted with earnestness upon the unprofitableness of such instructions. The revival of better taste, and a better knowledge of language, introduced contempt for the coarse style and the barbarous technicals of the scholastics. Confidence in the authority of Aristotle was shaken, by the rise of new Platonists; and a more independent spirit, was anxious to break the fetters, in which the human mind had moved with so heavy a gait. Towards the end of this period, all the more discerning, looked upon scholasticism, as the relic of a more barbarous age, and an armory of rusty weapons.

Notice. Jo. Gersonis Opera; studio *Lud. El. Du Pin;* Antw. 1705. V. vol. Fol.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF PARTICULAR DOCTRINES.

CHAPTER I.

THE CULTIVATION OF THE DOCTRINES PREVIOUSLY DEFINED.

Sec. 118. *The existence of God.*

John Damascenus founded belief of the existence of God, on the necessity of a first cause of all things, and on the marks of wisdom and design in the created universe. *Anselm* of Canterbury, with new and acute reasoning, inferred the existence of God, from the *conception* of an all-perfect being. But he met with an intelligent opponent, in *Gaunilo* a French Monk. His views were not adopted by *Peter Lombard;* but were so, by *Thomas;* who likewise bestowed attention on the proof from *design*, by *Richard* of St. Victor. *Duns Scotus* viewed the proof, from the mere conceptions of the mind, as unsatisfactory; and attributed entire adequacy, to the arguments from experience. *William Occam* represents all demonstration of the existence of God, as impossible; and Raymund of Sabunde, following the footsteps of Abelard, (Theol.christ.p.1349,)inferred our belief of God, very much in the manner of Kant, from the necessity, of supposing a Supreme Judge and Rewarder. (Theol. nat. Tract. 82, 83.)

Notices. *Anselm Canterb.* Proslogium et Monologium.—(*Gaunilonis*) Liber pro insipiente, contra Anselmi in proslogio ratiocinationem. *Anselmi* Liber apologeticus, contra Gaunilonem respondentem pro insipiente. (*W. C. L. Ziegler's* Contribution to the history of belief of a God; (German,) Gotting. 1792.)

Sec. 119. *Nature of God.*

Pantheism, founded on the new Platonic notions, was brought forward, by *John Scotus Erigena*, and defended by *Amalrich* of Bena (A.D. 1204), and his pupil *David Dinant;* but it was rejected by the church, and confuted by *Albert* and *Thomas*. The incomprehensibleness of God, was maintained with great strenuousness; and three ways for attaining to a knowledge of God, were recommended; namely via eminentiae, via negationis, and via causalitatis. The divine attributes were inferred, from the idea of a supreme and necessarily existing Being. The omnipotence and omnipresence of God, in particular, were the subject of many questions and investigations. Also the unity of God, was evinced by numerous arguguments, by *John Damascenus*, *Abelard*, and *Richard* of St. Victor. On all these subjects, *William Occam* manifested the sceptical turn of a Bayle.

Sec. 120. *Trinity.*

The theologians employed the greatest art, to make the doctrine of the Trinity more comprehensible, and to exhibit it as consonant with reason; but they came near to marring the received doctrines of the church. *Roscelin* was accused, by his opposers, of tritheism; and he was condemned in the council of Soissons, A. D. 1093. *Abelard* was taxed, sometimes with tritheism, and sometimes with Sabellian errors; the latter, with the most plausibility. *Anselm* and *Richard* of St. Victor, in their proofs of a Trinity, grazed lightly on Sabellianism; yet they met with no opposition; and the views of the latter, were again brought forward, by *Alexander Hales* and others. Even to *Peter Lombard*, great errors on this subject, were imputed, by Joachim, Abbot of Flora: but Innocent III. acquitted him, in the Lateran Council A. D. 1215. The nice distinction, which *Gilbert* of Porretta made, between *God himself* and the *attributes* of God, drew on him the attacks of St. Bernard, and

the animadversions of the Councils of Paris and Rheims, A. D. 1147 and 1248. In general, the scholastics found, n the doctrine of the Trinity, copious matter for the most acute speculations concerning the three Persons, and their relations to each other.

Sec. 121. *Creation, and Angels.*

The Aristotelian hypothesis, of the eternity of the world, was confuted by the scholastics; and yet several of them, e. g. *Thomas Aquinas*, maintained that it could not be disproved, by the light of nature, but only by the testimony of revelation. The design of God in creation, was, according to *Damascenus* and *Lombard*, to make manifest to rational beings his goodness; or according to *Thomas*, to communicate himself, as the highest good, to other beings. On the doctrine concerning Angels, *John Damascenus* adopted the views of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, in regard to the classification of the angels; and these views were received by the scholastics. In the Lateran Council, A. D. 1215, Pope *Innocent III.* established the positions, that the angels are spirits, and that God created them holy. The questions raised, concerning the nature and the creation of angels, and concerning the apostacy and influences of evil spirits, were almost innumerable. *Lombard* deemed it probable, that every soul is attended by a good and a bad angel; and this hypothesis was afterwards repeatedly brought forward.

Sec. 122. *Doctrine of Providence.*

Damascenus collected the most important ideas of the Greek fathers, respecting divine providence. The earlier scholastics touched on this subject, only occasionally, when they were treating of the wisdom, or of the will of God. *Thomas Aquinas* first gave it a full investigation. That this world is the *best* possible one, was held by *Anselm* and *Abelard*; *Thomas* and *Durand* believed, that God *could* have made a better. In regard to the divine cooperation, in the acts of his creatures, *Durand* contradicted the sentiments of *Thomas*. Upon

occasion of the rise of some Cathari, who leaned towards Manichaen sentiments; the righteousness of God in respect to the origination of evil, was further investigated by the scholastics, in accordance with the principles suggested by *Augustine*. In regard to moral evil, (that which merits punishment,) they discriminated between the antecedent will of God, and the consequent; and *Thomas* labored to prove, that, to the perfection of the world, beings were necessary, who were capable of sinning. Physical evil was considered as the inseparable, and in its effects, beneficial, consequence of sin.

Sec. 123. *The person of Christ.*

Although the Council of Chalcedon had published a determinate creed on this subject, yet the theologians involved themselves in new speculations and perplexities. The question, whether there should be attributed to Christ, only one simple will, or a twofold will, produced commotion in the East, and gave occasion to investigate more fully the *theandric* operations in Christ. But at length, the opinion of the Monothelites was put down, by the resistance made by the Popes, and by the decision of the sixth ecumenical council, A. D. 680. The discussions, respecting the connexion of the two natures in Christ, were actively renewed, in the eighth century, in consequence of the Adoptionist contests; and the tenet of the *Adoptionists*, [that Christ was the *Son* of God, only by *adoption*,] was condemned, by the French churches, and by the Popes. In the ninth century, *Paschasius Radbert* and *Ratram* of *Corbie*, involved themselves in a useless contest, respecting the manner in which Christ was born. *Lombard*, by his solicitude to evince the unity of the person of Christ, made such nice distinctions, as brought on him the charge of a new heresy, Nihilianism, [that the *human nature* of Christ, separate from the divine, was *nothing*.] In general, the theologians of the scholastic age, were not satisfied, with retailing the nice distinctions of the fathers, on this doctrine, but they added a great number of new questions and subtilties.

Notices. *C. W. Fr. Walch,* Historia controversiae Secul. IX. de Partu beatae Virginis. Gotting. 1758. 4to.

On the heresy of Nihilianism, of which Peter Lombard and Peter of Poictiers were accused ; (in German,) in *Cramer's* Continuation of Bossuet. vol. VII. p. 1 &c.

Sec. 124. *Man, particularly his soul.*

Respecting man, and especially the soul, after the example set by *John Damascenus,* much foreign matter, derived from Aristotle's writings, was introduced into theology. As to the origin of the soul, it was not yet decided, whether its immediate creation, or its propagation, ought to be believed : *Anselm,* however, *Hugo* of *St. Victor, Robert Pulleyn,* and *Lombard,* declared for its creation; and they were followed by the majority of divines. The adoption of Aristotelian principles, might be supposed hazardous to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; yet from that very source, *Thomas* derived arguments for the doctrine; and of course, *Scotus* on the contrary, declared the doctrine not provable by the light of nature, and rested its evidence solely on revelation. Various proofs in support of it, were adduced by *Moneta* of *Cremona, Raymund Martini, Raymund* of *Sabunde,* and *Martin Ficinus.* In the Council of the Lateran, held A.D. 1513, by Leo X. it was deemed necessary, to condemn explicitly, the doctrine that the soul is in its nature mortal; and at the same time, it was forbidden, to make a distinction between philosophical and theological truth.— The Mosaic account of the state of the first human pair, was explained, by *John Damascenus* and *Lombard,* in both a literal and a spiritual sense; and all the Scholastics were content to allegorize copiously on the subject. The *image* of God, was distinguished from *his likeness,* by the Scholastics, just as by the fathers; and the *image* of God, was traced in the rational nature and free agency of man, while *likeness* to him was understood to mean conformity with the divine will.

Sec. 125. *Resurrection and judgment.*

The received doctrine of the church respecting the resurrection, remained unaltered. *Moneta* defended it, at full length, against the Cathari. (Adv. Catharos et Waldenses p. 344.) The restoration of the identical body, with all its parts, and with the distinction of the sexes, was maintained. On this subject, and respecting the general judgment, a multitude of curious questions were proposed. That the blessed will no more sin, and lose their bliss; and that the damned can never repent and become happy, all admitted. Their descriptions of heaven, were most alluring; of hell, the most terrific. According to the more general opinion, hell-punishment consisted in actual fire; yet some, as *Guido* of *Nogent*, conceived of it, as only mental suffering, or anguish arising from the consciousness of sin.

Notice. *Guiberti*, de Pignoribus Sanctorum. Lib. IV. c. 4. Opp. p. 363.

Sec. 126. *Truth of Christianity.*

While the christian doctrines were explained, critically, and hypercritically, a thought was rarely bestowed on the evidence of the tenableness of Christianity itself. This arose from there being no learned opposers; from the persuasion, that any doubt respecting the doctrines held by the church, would be sinful; and from the facility of putting down any opposition, by coercion instead of argument. To the enemies of Christianity, were now added the Muhammedans; who taxed the christians with being polytheists and idolaters. The common writings, in opposition to them and the Jews, contained little that was of importance; and only *Raymund Martini* (d. 1286) appeared to advantage in the controversy. Yet while the power of the hierarchy, could easily suppress all attacks on the established faith, there were visible indications, that the enthusiastic reverence for Aristotle, and the close adherence to his writings, had misled

many a thinking man to undervalue christianity. This induced *Thomas Aquinas*, to write an Apology for christianity; in which he showed, that some christian doctrines are discoverable by reason, and that the others are accordant with reason. Towards the end of this period, the two contemporaries, *Hieronymus Savanarola* (d. 1498) and *Marsilius Ficinus* (d. 1499,) evinced the reasonableness of christianity, and also its divine origin: the latter they argued, from its sublime contents, from its excellent effects, from the credibility of the Apostles, from miracles and prophecies.

Notices. *Raymundi Martini* Pugio fidei, contra Mauros et Judaeos; cum observationibus Josephi de Voisin, et introductione Jo. Ben. Carpzovii. Lips. 1687. Fol.

S. Thomae Summa catholica, contra Gentiles, Lib. IV. Lugd. 1587. Fol.

Marsilii Ficini de Religione christiana et fidei pietate; Opp. Tom. I. Paris 1641.

Hieronymi Savanarolae Triumphus crucis; s. de veritate fidei; Bas. 1540. Fol.

Sec. 127. *The Holy Scriptures.*

The Bible was uniformly held up as a most holy book, and a source of religious instruction. The divinity of its origin, however, was often rather assumed than shown, and was only touched upon by *Damascenus*;—a defect, which *Duns Scotus* endeavored to supply. (Comment. in Lib. Sentent. p. 5.) Their ideas of inspiration were fluctuating and indistinct; and were expressed, sometimes more moderately, as by *Agobard* and *Euthymius*, and sometimes more strongly, as by *Thomas Aquinas*; but always only incidentally. Next to the Bible, tradition, as serving to explain and extend the instructions of the holy Scriptures, held as high, or rather a higher authority, than it did in the preceding period. To the canon of the Bible, among the Latins, (but not among the Greeks,) the same extent was given, as formerly by Augustine. The use made of the Bible by the *Wal-*

densians, was an occasion of the Popes and the Council's setting bounds to its unrestrained influence.

Notices. For the opinion of the later Syrian churches, respecting the Apocalypse, see *Eichhorn's* Introduction to the N. T. (in German,) vol. II. p. 433.

Jac. Usserii Historia dogmatica controversiae inter Orthodoxos et Pontificios, de Scripturis et Sacris vernaculis;—locupletavit *Henr. Wharton;* Lond. 1690. 4to.—*Tob. Godof. Hegelmaier*, de Libero Sac. Script. usu, plebi christiano diu denegato, tandem hic ibi restituto; Tub. 1783. 4to.—History of the prohibition of the Bible; (by the same author; in German.) Ulm. 1783. 8vo. *A. I. Onymus*, Essay of a History of the prohibition of the Bible; (in German,) Würzb. 1786. 8vo.

CHAPTER II.

DEVELOPEMENT OF DOCTRINES NOT BEFORE DEFINED.

Sec. 128. *Procession of the Holy Spirit.*

The disagreement, which existed in the former period, but was there scarcely noticed, between the Latin and the Greek churches, in regard to the question, whether the Holy Spirit proceeded from *both* the Father and the Son, or only from the Father; now produced strong sensation. The addition [et filio] to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which first appeared in Spain, was continually more and more generally received, in the Latin churches, notwithstanding Pope *Leo* III. refused it his sanction. Afterwards, when *Photius* [Abp. of Constantinople] charged the Latins with error and forgery, various western writers rose up against him. The accusations of Photius were renewed, in the eleventh century, by the Greeks; and were retorted with vehemence by the Latins. Thenceforth, this subject was one of the principal points of contention between the

two churches, occupied the writers on both sides, and in every attempt at compromise, was an insurmountable obstacle. The Greeks were, indeed, persuaded to accede to the Latin notion, at the Councils of Lyons (A. D. 1274) and of Florence (A. D. 1439); but they soon returned to their old opinion.

Notices. In addition to the writings mentioned, sec. 76, see *Petri Pithoei* Historia controversiae de processione Spiritus S. Paris 1590. 8vo.—De processione Spir. S. Dissertatio prima Damascenica; in the Opera Joannis Damasceni, ed. *M. Le Quien.* Tom. I.—*Theophanis Procopowitz,* tractatus de process. Sp. S. Gothae 1772. 8vo.

Sec. 129. *Doctrine of sin and grace and the kindred subjects, in the Greek church.*

The Greeks continued to hold the system of doctrines, which had been inculcated by their earlier doctors, particularly Chrysostom; and without giving attention to the modifications, which, through the influence of Augustine, had become prevalent among the Latins. In *John Damascenus,* we still find it represented, that Adam's sin brought death and dissolution on his posterity; but not a trace of any propagated incapacity for goodness, or of any connate guilt. He acknowledges that it is impossible, without the help of God, to will and to do what is good; but represents it as depending on us, whether to follow God, or the evil One; and he insists, that God allots the destiny of men, according to their voluntary actions. (de Fide orthodoxa Lib. II. c. 30. compare Lib. IV. c. 20.) The later Greek writers, as *Theodorus Studita, Thophylact,* and *Euthymius Zigabenus,* repeat similar ideas.

Sec. 130. *Latin churches*

These doctrines gave to the Latin theologians, more copious matter for investigation. *Augustine,* who was reverenced as a Saint, had indeed set forth a determinate system of belief respecting sin and grace; but, with his writings, those of *John Cassian* were also much

read; and even St. Benedict had prescribed the reading of Cassians's Collations in the monasteries. Hence, without being sensible of it, men might easily swerve from pure Augustinism; and this was the more likely to take place, because more moderate sentiments were to be found, in abundance, in the writings of Augustine himself. *Isidore of Seville* held strictly with Augustine;—the twofold predestination not excepted. So also did *Beda* and *Alcuin*. But when *Gottschalk* advanced the same twofold predestination, he was oppressed, through the influence of *Rabanus Maurus*, and *Hincmar* of Rheims. As *Prudentius of Troyes*, *Servatus Lupus*, *Ratramnus* and *Remigius*, appeared in defence of Gottschalk, and as the treatise of *John Scotus* was confuted by *Prudentius* and by *Florus;* Hincmar caused the four following propositions, to be established, in the Council of *Chiersy* A. D. 853. I. God hath predestinated some men unto salvation; but not others to perdition. II. We lost free will, by Adam; and recover it by Christ. III. God wills the salvation of all men. IV. Christ died for all men. But a great part of the French churches deemed these propositions inconsistent with the pure—that is, with the Augustinian doctrine; and the decisions of Chiersy, were contravened by others, made in the councils of *Valence* (A. D. 855.) and *Langres* (A. D. 859.) Although Hincmar was not able fully to overcome such opposition, yet from this time onward, there was less hesitation, to soften down some points of the Augustinian system.

Notices. Veterum auctorum, qui saeculo IX. de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt, Opera; cura et studio *Guilberti Mauguin*. Paris 1650. II. vol. 4to. *Ludov. Celloti*, Historia Godeschalci; Paris 1655. Fol.
The most noticeable things in the life and writings of Hincmar, Abp. of Rheims; (in German,) by *Wolfg. Fried. Gess;* Gotting. 1806. p. 15—95.

Sec. 131. *Doctrine of the Scholastics concerning sin.*

The scholastics received the Augustinian doctrine, that, by Adam's transgression, mortality, sin, and guilt passed

upon his posterity; but they introduced various new explications and definitions. *Augustine* considered hereditary sin, to be *sensuality (concupiscentia)*. *Anselm*, the better to explain, how Christ was born without sin, looked upon it, as being the *want* of original righteousness (defectus justitiae originalis); which is imputed to all Adam's posterity, though not in the same degree, as if they had sinned personally. *Peter Lombard* followed Augustine; *Bonaventura* and *Thomas Aquinas* endeavored to combine the ideas of both; *Duns Scotus* held with Anselm. The earlier doctors, including *Anselm* and *Pulleyn*, adopted Augustine's opinion, that unbaptized infants are damned, on account of hereditary sin. *Peter Lombard* softened this doctrine, by discriminating between a deprivation of the vision of God, and punishments by remorse of conscience and other pains; and by holding that, only the former impended over these infants. This solution met so general approbation, that *Gregory* of Rimini (d. 1378,) by adhering to the harsher opinion, incurred the appellation of the *Infant-Tormenter*. To explain the manner, in which hereditary sin is propagated, concerning which Augustine made no decision, cost the scholastics much trouble. Some supposed a propagation of the soul itself; others, the contamination of the soul by the corrupt body; and others, as Anselm and Thomas, an imputation of sin, to all participaters in human nature. Finally, the *Thomists* differed from the *Scotists* in this, that the former adhered more strongly to the Augustinian opinion, of a complete incapacity for goodness; while the latter conceded to men, a capacity for, at least some imperfect goodness.

Sec. 132. *Sinless conception of Mary.*

The fathers had, in former times, exempted Christ from the contamination of hereditary sin; and had considered this as the reason of his miraculous conception; but the idea had not yet occurred, that this privilege was also extended, to Mary the mother of Jesus. The ever

increasing veneration, for the mother of God, however, made no distinction appear too great, to be ascribed to her. *Paschasius Radbert* was, perhaps, the first that expressed the thought, that Mary was conceived without hereditary sin. In the twelfth century, this opinion was spread in France; and a festival devoted to it, began to be observed. Yet both the opinion and the festival, were expressly disapproved, by *St. Bernard;* and rejected, by *Albert* the Great, and *Thomas Aquinas;* and were not received, even by the Franciscan *John Bonaventura*, who was so great an admirer of Mary. But, after *Duns Scotus* came forth as a warm defender of the immaculate conception, the Franciscans made it a point of honor with their order, to maintain this opinion against the Dominicians; and when *John de Montesono*, (A. D. 1387,) declared it an error, the whole university of Paris rose up against him. The Council of Basle declared in favor of the Franciscans. The Popes ventured not, to decide the contest between these two powerful orders; yet Sixtus IV. favored the Franciscans, by approving a ritual for their festival, (A. D. 1476,) and by threatening with excommunication, (A. D. 1483,) whoever should represent belief in the immaculate conception, to be a heresy.

Notices. Histoire du Concile de Trent, par Fra *Paolo Sarpi*; traduite par *P. Fr. de Courayer*. T. I. p. 322—325. *Fried. Ulr. Calixti* Historia immaculatae conceptionis beatae virginis; Helmst. 1696. 4to.

Sec. 133. *Doctrine of grace.*

Attempts were made, to fix the import of the ambiguous term *grace*, by discriminating gratia gratis dans, gratis data, gratum faciens, praeveniens s. operans, comitans s. cooperans. But the chief difficulty was, to reconcile the sentiments expressed by Augustine, with the idea of freedom: and the doctors seemed more and more to incline towards Pelagianism; against which, *Anselm* and *Bernard* of Clairveaux made resistance. *Peter Lombard*

held, for the most part, to the Augustinian principles; but without being able, to solve all the difficulties. *Thomas Aquinas* likewise admitted, that without regenerating grace, a man can perform nothing well pleasing to God; but, that being awaked by preventing grace, a man can prepare himself for regenerating grace. He ascribed to all good works, so far as they are the product of grace, the merit of congruity (meritum ex congruo); and so far as the man himself is active, the merit of fitness (meritum ex condigno). *Duns Scotus* on the contrary, believed, that without grace, a man may acquire the merit of fitness, but not that of congruity; and that he can, in some measure, make himself fit to become a subject of grace; while yet, it is impossible to remove from God the charge of partiality. *Peter Abelard* asserted, in very strong terms, that the heathen are capable of virtue, and of salvation; but people did not venture to follow him: and at most they only admitted, that Gregory the Great, had rescued the Emperor Trajan from hell, by his intercessions. Justification (justificatio) was considered, as an effect of grace, and was viewed, as the infusing of righteousness, with which the forgiveness of sin was connected. But of the fact, whether a person has grace or not, according to *Thomas Aquinas*, there may be probable, but not certain evidence.

Sec. 134. *Predestination.*

In substance, the earlier Scholastics, as *Peter Lombard* and *Thomas*, adhered to the Augustinian doctrine of unconditional decrees; for they held, that the ground for reprobation, was the sinfulness of men; but that the only ground of election, is the good pleasure of God. Yet *John Bonaventura* asserted, that the susceptibility or unsusceptibility of men, was a reason, though not the sole basis of the divine decrees. This idea was eagerly seized by the later Scholastics, and was extended still farther. The *Scotists* referred election directly to the foreknowledge of God; and the *Thomists* also, sought to

introduce some palliations. Mere displeasure, at seeing almost the whole world verging towards the errors of Pelagius, induced *Thomas* of *Bradwardina* (d. 1349), to defend unconditional election, in its strictest form; and *John Wickliff* held similar views.

Notices. *Thomae Bradwardini* de causa Dei, contra Pelagium; studio *Henr. Savilii;* Lond. 1618. Fol.

Joan. Wicleft Dialogorum Libri IV. Francf. et Lips. 1753. 4to.

Sec. 135. *Redemption by Christ.*

John Damascenus borrowed from *Gregory Nizianzen*, a renunciation of the opinion, that Christ paid his life a ransom to the devil; and in this, *Robert Pulleyn* agreed with him. *Anselm* of *Canterbury*, in his work, Cur Deus homo, endeavored to explain more fully, the object of redemption; and he represented the sufferings of Christ, as a satisfaction offered to divine justice, for the sins of men; and which no one, unless he were both God and man, could have accomplished. *Abelard* doubted, whether mankind were under the power of the devil, from which they needed to be rescued; but he was strenuously opposed by St. *Bernard*. *Peter Lombard* made no use of Anselm's theory, but stopped short with the position, that men are delivered from sin and the dominion of the devil, and are brought to love God, by Jesus Christ. *Albert* the *Great*, and *Alexander Hales*, made use of Anselm's ideas; but *Thomas Aquinas* discussed the subject the most fully. He is the first, that treated extensively of the high-priestly office of Christ. He showed, that the death of Christ, is to be considered as a satisfaction and an offering; and that its efficacy, is not only adequate, but more than adequate, (superabundans meritum,) to redeem men from the guilt and punishment of sin, and from the power of the devil, and to open to them the gates of heaven. *Duns Scotus* contradicted Thomas; and would not allow the sufferings of Christ, to be a full

equivalent for the sins of men, though he admitted, that God accepted them as equivalent.

Sec. 136. *Of faith and good works.*

Faith and good works were generally considered, as the means of obtaining a participation in divine blessings. *John Damascenus* discriminates two kinds of faith, the reception of the christian doctrines, and a firm reliance on the promises of God; of which, the former depends on ourselves, and the latter is the gift of God. The Scholastics adopted the ideas of Augustine. They understood by faith, approbation given to the divine doctrines; considered it as a gift of God; and brought forward many divisions of it (Fides *quae* et *quâ* creditur, informis et formata, explicita, implicita). Value was ascribed to faith, only when connected with love and hope, and followed by good works; nay, it was itself regarded as the first of virtues. Good works originate, partly from grace, and partly from free-will, when it is made sound by grace: and such works are meritorious. *Lombard* pronounced all works, done without faith, to be bad. The hypothesis, formed in the preceding period, respecting works of supererogation, was held and enlarged in this. *Thomas* describes unbelief, as the greatest of all sins: and he held it to be right, to compel heretics and apostates, though not also Jews and Pagans, to believe. In treating on these subjects, the Scholastic doctors interwove extensively, statements in moral or practical theology.

Sec. 137. *Adoration of saints and of Mary.*

Praying to the saints, had become customary, in the preceding period; and the mother of God, was looked upon as the queen of heaven; yet it was deemed necessary, to guard against the danger and the reproach of idolatry. Hence, the distinction of worship, among the Greeks, into λατρεια and προσκυνησις, (*Mansi*, XII. 377. *Theodorus Stud.* Opp. p. 521,) and among the Latins, into *latria*, *dulia*, and *hyperdulia* (*Lombard* III. 9. *Thom.* P. III.

qu. 25). The worship of images, which commenced at an earlier period, produced in the eighth century, most violent contests. It was zealously defended by *John Damascenus;* forbidden by a Council, A. D. 754; again established by another, at Nice (A. D. 787); disapproved by *Charlemagne*, and the French Bishops; yet taken under protection by the Romish Popes; and at last, it became fully established in the Greek and Romish churches. Religious veneration was also paid to the cross, and to relics; and *Thomas* assigns to the former even latria.

Notice. *Jo. Dallaei* adversus Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto traditionem disputatio; Genev. 1665. 4to. *Nat. Alexandri* Hist. Eccles. N. T. Secul. V. Diss. XXV.

Sec. 138. *The Sacraments in general.*

The definitions given of the sacraments, were diverse and ambiguous. Among the Greeks, *John Damascenus* makes mention of only baptism and the Lord's supper; and *Theodorus Studita*, after the example of the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, enumerates six sacraments. The Latins took Augustine's idea for their first principle: Sacramentum est signum rei sacrae, s. invisibilis gratiae visibilis forma (a sacrament is a sign of a holy thing, or, the visible form of invisible grace). Yet respecting the number of the sacraments, they were not agreed. *Rabanus Maurus*, and *Paschasius Radbert*, name four of them; *St. Bernard* adds the washing of feet; *Hugo* of *St. Victor*, includes among them holy water, and the consecration of clocks, &c. *Peter Damian*, (Opp. T. II. p. 167—169,) even makes twelve sacraments of the church. *Otto* Bishop of Bamberg, was the first that, A. D. 1124, enumerated seven sacraments; baptism, confirmation, anointing the sick, the Lord's supper, penance, marriage, and ordination; and through the influence of *Peter Lombard*, and of *Gratian*, who introduced the same sentiments into his Decretum, the admission of this number became general among the doctors, and received the approbation of Pope Eugene IV.

at the Council of Florence, A. D. 1439. (*Mansi* Concil. T. XXXI. p. 1054.) Various reasons likewise were assigned, why just this number of sacraments should be admitted: and yet it should be noticed, that equal sanctity, and equal importance, were, by no means, attributed to all the sacraments. According to *Thomas Aquinas*, who is the most full on the nature of them, a sacrament is an institution, in which God, by visible signs, imparts his invisible grace, and applies the effects of Christ's merits to men. For, although God is not confined to the use of such means, yet it is necessary for men, to be recovered by means of sensible objects, since it was by such objects they were led to the apostacy. Sacraments were not necessary, in the state of innocence, but only since the fall of man. All the sacraments of the New Testament, were instituted by Christ, as God; and they derive their efficacy from the sufferings of Christ: they produce the graces, which the sacraments of the Old Testament only prefigured. The efficacy of a sacrament, does not depend on the faith and the uprightness of the clergymen, who administer it; and yet it is necessary, that he should have the *intention* of administering that sacrament. From some of the positions of Thomas, other doctors departed. *Alexander Hales* believed, that only two sacraments were instituted by Christ himself, the others being introduced by his ministers; and in particular, that the sacrament of confirmation, was not instituted by either Christ or the apostles, but by the Council of Meaux. *Hugo* of *St. Victor*, *Scotus*, and *Occam*, differed from Thomas, in their explanation of the sacraments. The Thomists also contended with the Scotists, whether the gracious operative power (virtus instrumentalis et effectiva) were *in* the sacraments themselves, by divine establishment; or whether it rested on the promise of God, that *he* would impart his grace, so often as a sacrament was administered. The opinion of Thomas, that the sacraments of the Old Testament, only prefigured grace, but did not impart it, was rejected by *John*

Bonaventura and *Scotus;* and previously, *Beda* had taught the contrary; but it was established, by *Eugene* IV, at the Council of *Florence*, A.D. 1439. (*Mansi* Concil. XXXI. p. 1054.) The Scholastics, moreover, believed in a two-fold operation of the sacraments, ex opere operantis, et ex opere operato. The dissenting parties from the general church, that arose during this period, either attached little value to the sacraments, as the *Brethren of the free Spirit;* or they rejected some of them, or at least, the views the church entertained of them, as the *Waldensians*, the *Wicklifiites* and the *Hussites*.

Sec. 139. *Of Baptism.*

The doctrine of baptism, was perfected by St. *Thomas*, according to the principles of *Peter Lombard*. The effect of baptism is (justificatio) justification. A person obtains, by baptism, forgiveness of the debt of sin, and sanctification. An infant receives remission of the guilt of hereditary sin; the adult, forgiveness not only of hereditary sin, but also of his preceding actual sins. Although there was difference of opinion, whether, in baptism, only forgiveness of sin, or also the grace that sanctifies, were imparted; yet *Clement* V. at the Council of Vienne, A. D. 1311, declared the latter supposition most probable. (*Mansi*, Concil. XXV. 411.) Yet the innate evil lust, (concupiscentia,) remained, after baptism; though not as guilt or sin, but only an incentive to sin; against which a person has occasion for conflict. When a person receives merely the semblance of baptism, or baptism only in appearance, this will have no beneficial effects. Every baptism is valid, which is performed in the name of the Trinity; and, as it impresses an indelible character, it must not be repeated. When any person desires to be baptized, but is prevented, without his fault, it is as good as if he were actually baptized; and the Spirit of God sanctifies him:—so taught *Lombard* and *Thomas* and *St. Bernard*, in opposition to some other doctors, as e. g. *Rabanus Maurus*. The

right to baptize, belongs to the priests; yet in cases of necessity, it is lawful for the deacons, and even for the laity, to baptize. Baptism produces a spiritual relation; and it is to be preceded by an exorcism, and in the case of adults, by catechetical instruction. The faith which is lacking in infant baptism, is supplied by the faith of the sponsors, or of the church. Immersion in the water, was customary, until the thirteenth century; when it was exchanged by the Latins for sprinkling, though still retained by the Greeks. The church moreover, had to contend with the Cathari, and particularly the *Petrobrusians*, who denied the efficacy of baptism generally, and rejected infant baptism; these, it was, *Moneta* (adv. Cath. et Waldenses, p. 277.) undertook to confute.

Notice. Petitorium exhortatorium pro resolutione super grossis quibusdam dubietatibus—circa Sacramentum—baptissni;—per fratrem *Wilhelmum de Stuttgardia* (Guliel. Holderum); Tubing. 1594. See, New Gotting. historical Magazine (in German) by *Meiners* and *Spittler*, voll. III. p. 228—272.

Sec. 140. *Of confirmation.*

The Latin church gradually adopted the principle, derived from the Greek church, that the anointing of baptized persons with consecrated oil, was to be performed only by a bishop. A consequence of this was, that this transaction was separated from baptism. *Lombard* and *Thomas* declared themselves at full length, on this subject. By this unction, they supposed that, power was imparted to the spiritual life, which commenced at baptism, to increase its strength, and to contend against spiritual foes; and that the person became a partaker of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. This sacrament imparts an indelible character; and therefore must not be repeated: nor can any baptized person refuse it. And finally, there must be present at it, some witnesses, by whom the confirmed child is to be brought up. Nearly all

these principles were stated by *Eugene IV.* But *John Wicklif* doubted, whether confirmation had an adequate foundation.

Notices. *Jo. Dallaei*, de duobus Latinorum ex Unctione Sacramentis, Confirmatione et extrema unctione, Dissertatio; Genev. 1669. *Ejusd.* de cultibus religiosis Latinorum, Libri IX. Genev. 1671. Lib. II. p. 94. Comp. *Natal. Alexandri* Historia eccles. N. T. saecul. II. Dis. X.

Sec. 141. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

The Lord's supper was looked upon, as spiritual nourishment for the soul; and as that which produced the unity of the church. On the use of leavened bread, from the eleventh century, the Latins had controversy with the Greeks; but at length, they brought the Greeks to hold with them. The hosts were introduced; and mixing the wine with water, was considered as necessary, yet not absolutely essential. Eating the Lord's supper, is not so indispensable, as baptism; yet no christian should neglect it; and though Christ instituted it *after* a supper, yet it is proper for christians to receive it, in the morning, and fasting. The ancient custom of presenting the Lord's supper to children, was laid aside in the western churches, after the twelfth century.

Notices. *Godofr. Hermanni* Historia concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato in coena Domini; Lips. 1737. 8vo.

Iac. Sirmondi Diss. de azymo; Opp. T. IV. p. 513. ed. Paris. p. 351. ed. Venice.

Mich. le Quien, de azymis Diss.—the sixth of his Diss. Damasceniea; in Opp. Damasceni. Tom. I. p. LXXI.

Petri Zornii Historia eucharistiae infantum; Berol. 1736. 8vo.

Sec. 142. *Transmutation in the Lord's Supper.*

Historians. In addition to the works mentioned Sec. 102, see the following.

Simplicii Verini (Claudii Salmasii) de transubstantiatione Liber; ed. 2. Lugd. Bat. 1660.

Historia transubstantiationis papalis;—excudi permisit *Joannes* (Cosin) Ep. Dunelmens. Lond. 1675. Brem. 1678. 8vo. *Jo. G. Walchii*, Historia transubst. pontificiae; in his Miscell. sacra; Amstel. 1744.

Insigniores Romanae ecclesiae variationes circa Eucharistiam; in *S. Deyling*, Observatt. sacris et miscellaneis; P. IV. p. 178.

Novitas errorum Pontificiorum circa Eucharistiam; ibid. P. V. p. 246.

Natalis Alexandri, de reali praesentia corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, et de transubstantiatione panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi: Diss. XII. ad Saecul. XI. et XII. Histor. ecclesia N. T.

Historia concertationis Graecorum Latinorumque de transubstantiatione in sacro Eucharistiae sacramento; auctore *I. Rud. Kiesling*. Lips. 1764. 8vo.

In the Greek church, *John Damascenus* collected the strongest passages of the fathers, concerning the transformation; and also denied, that after consecration the supper was to be called a sign or representation of the body of Christ; and this principle was maintained, in the second Nicene Council, A. D, 787, in opposition to the decision of the Council of Constantinople. of the year 754. The later Greeks, as *Theophylact* and *Euthymius Zigabenus*, follow John Damascenus; but though they speak of the transformation, they do not agree perfectly with the doctrine of the Romish church. The western doctors expressed themselves differently, and ambiguously; and yet, in the days of Charlemagne, it was admitted, that, the bread was not to be regarded as a mere representative of the body of Christ. In the ninth century, *Paschasius Radbert* stated the transmutation of the bread into the body of Christ, and of the wine into his blood, with a clearness and precision, never before used on the subject; and he insisted, that every orthodox man must so believe. He was contradicted by *Raban Mauras*, *Ratram*, and *John Scotus;* yet he also found adherents.

Notices. Paschasii Radberti, de corpore et sanguine Domini, Liber; in his Opp. (cura Iac. Sirmondi;) Lutet.

1618 &c. and in *Martene* et *Durandi* Collect. ampliss. veter. monumentorum ; T. IX. p. 373.

Ratramni (Bertram) de corpore et sanguine Domini ; à Quevilly 1673. 8vo. Amstel. 1718. 12mo.

Sec. 143. *Contest with Berengarius.*

The contest concerning the Eucharist, occasioned by Paschasius Radbert, remained indeed undetermined, but Radbert's views continued to spread in the church. They were advocated by the famous *Gerbert;* who taxed the opposers of them, with odious consequences: and miracles also were resorted to, in defence of them. Thus, after the middle of the eleventh century, it had come to this, that a man was accounted an errorist, who deviated from those views. *Berengarius* of *Tours* was accused by *Lanfrank*, because, in conformity with John Scotus, he denied the transmutation of the bread; while yet he admitted the real presence of Christ's body in the supper. Pope *Leo* XI. in the Council of *Vercelli*, A. D. 1050, condemned Berengarius, and the writings of *Scotus*, as heretical; and *Nicolaus* II. at the Council of Rome, A. D. 1059, pressed Berengarius to a recantation, and to assent to a formula of faith. Yet, even after a second recantation, to which he was sentenced by *Gregory* VII. Berengarius returned back to his former opinions. It was now become manifest, that the church would tolerate no other sentiment, than that of the transformation of the bread.

Notices. *Gerberti* de corpore et sanguine Domini Liber: in *Bern. Pez.* Thesau. Anecdot. Nov. T. I. P. II. *Christ. Matth. Pfaff*, Tractatus de stercoranistis medii aevi; Tubing. 1750. 4to. *Lanfranci*, de corpore et sang. Domini Liber; in his Opp. ed. L. d'Archery; Lutet. 1618. *Guitmundi* de corp. et sang. Christi veritate in Eucharistia Lib. III. in Biblioth. max. Patr. T. XVIII. *Adelmanni*, de veritate corp. et sang. Domini, ad Berengar. Ep. ed. *C. A. Schmid;* Brun. 1770. 8vo. Berengarius, or Announcement of an important work by him; by *G. E. Lessing;* (Germ.) 1770. Berengarius

Turonensis; by *C. F. Stäudlin*, (Germ.) in his and *Tzschirner's* Archiv. Vol. II. P. 1. *Jo. Mabillon*, de multiplici Berengarii damnatione; in *J. Vogt*, Biblioth. haeresiol. T. I.

Sec. 144. *Scholastics and Canonists.*

In this state came the doctrine of the Eucharist into the hands of the scholastics, to whom it afforded abundant matter for examination. Yet the form of the doctrine, was not yet unchangeably fixed. *Hildebert* of *Tours*, taught distinctly, the transmutation of the bread; and he used for it the new term (transubstantiatio) transubstantiation. *Rupert* of *Duys*, on the contrary, taught that, the substance of the bread and wine were not destroyed, nor changed. *Lombard* acknowledges, that the substance of the bread and wine are changed, at the consecration, by the words of Christ, into the substance of the body and blood of Christ; and that in each element, there is a whole Christ. But he knew not how to extricate himself from the various difficulties, which pressed themselves upon him. His contemporary *Gratian*, introduced the idea of transubstantiation into his code of Canon Law; and thus procured it higher respect, and a more extensive diffusion. At last, *Innocent* III. upon occasion of the opposition to it by the Waldensians and other sects, solemnly established this doctrine, in the Lateran Council of A. D. 1215.

Notice. Concil. Lateran. Cap. I. Una est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur; transubstantiatis, pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit Apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus.

Sec. 145. *Further determinations.*

The now received doctrine of the church, was further developed by *Alexander Hales*, *Albert* the *Great*, and especially, by *Thomas Aquinas*. It was determined, that, through the power of God, only the external accidents of bread remained, without the substance; and that merely the outward form was broken, while the body of Christ remained entire. The question was raised, whether a beast, that should devour the host, would receive the body of Christ. *Thomas* affirmed, and *Bonaventura* denied. The festival of the Holy Body, was regulated by *Urban* IV, A. D. 1264, on occasion of a revelation to *Juliana* of Lüttich, as a memorial of transubstantiation; and was finally established, by *Clement* V. A. D. 1311. Notwithstanding the various confirmations of the doctrine of transubstantiation, *John* of *Paris* (d. 1306) ventured to teach, that the reception of this doctrine, was not absolutely necessary; and that the real presence of Christ, might be explained to be an *impanation*. According to the views of *William Occam*, transubstantiation is not expressly taught in the holy scriptures; but it was supposed that, God revealed it to the holy fathers, or that it became manifest to them, while carefully studying passages of the bible. *John Wicklif* rejected transubstantiation; but *John Huss* admitted it.

Notices. *Joannis Parisiensis* determinatio de modo existendi corporis Christi in sacramento altaris; (ed. *Petr. Alix.*) Lond. 1686. 8vo.

Mus extenteratus; hoc est, Tractatus valde magistralis super quaestione quadam theologicali, spinosa et multum subtili, ut intus. Scriptus—per fratrem *Wilhelmum de Stuttgardia*, ordinis Minorum (Gulielm. Holderum); Tubing. 1593. 4to.—See New Gotting. Magazin, by *Miners* and *Spittler*, vol. II. p. 716—734.

Sec. 146. *Consequences of the doctrine of transubstantiation.*

The belief that, by the transmutation, Christ was present in the Eucharist, gave rise to the custom of worshipping the elevated host, by prostration; concerning which, *Honorius* III. published an ordinance A. D. 1217. It being admitted that, entire Christ was contained under each form, that of bread as well as that of wine, would naturally lead to the thought that, either of them was sufficient, without the other. It therefore became customary, after the host had been for some time immersed in the wine, to withhold the cup from the laity. This practice, which was approved by *Robert Pulleyn*, and defended by *Alexander Hales*, *Bonaventura* and *Thomas Aquinas*, in a little time obtained general currency in the church. And when *James* of *Misa*, in the fifteenth century, restored the use of the cup, at Prague, the Council of *Constance*, A. D. 1415, rejected this innovation; and ordained, that the priests should receive the Eucharist under both forms, but the laity under one form only. The Council of *Basle*, however, found it necessary, A. D. 1436, to allow the restless Hussites the use of the cup; yet with this explanation, that the church has power, to prescribe the manner in which the Eucharist shall be received.

Notices. De Adoratione Eucharistiae Libri II; auctore *Petro Boileau*; Lutet. 1685. 8vo.

Joan. Guil. de Lith, Disquisitio theologica et histor. de adoratione panis consecrati et interdictione calicis in Eucharistia; edita a *Joan. Car. de Lith;* Suobaci 1753. 8vo.

Jo. And. Schmid, Commentt. de fatis calicis eucharistici in ecclesia Romana; Helmst. 1708.

Spittler's History of the eucharistical cup; (in German,) Lemgo 1780. 8vo.

Sec. 147. *Of the Mass.*

The hypothesis, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, by

which the sacrifice of Christ is renewed, and that it imparts peculiar efficacy to the prayers, that are offered in connexion with it; came down from the preceding period. The Romish Canon of the Mass, though differently modified, was introduced into various Latin churches. Silent Masses, and Masses for the dead, began to appear, at the commencement of this period; and although they at first met with opposition, they became very general; being favored especially by the increasing prevalence of a belief in Purgatory. Thus was formed the belief, that the Mass averts evils of all sorts, and procures various divine blessings; and that the Eucharist, whether participated by the person, or not, is efficacious in his behalf: and these Masses became a prolific source of income to the clergy. The scholastic doctors, as *Lombard* and *Thomas*, touch upon this subject but slightly. *Innocent* III. established the Canon of the Mass, in the Lateran Council of A. D. 1215. All those sects, which opposed the prevailing church, and particularly *John Wicklif*, rejected the doctrine of the Mass.

Notices. *Ge. Calixti* Diss. de pontificio Missae sacraficio; Francf. 1644.—*Ejusd.* Exercitatio de Missis solitariis; Helmst. 1647.

J. Fr. Buddei Diss. de origine missae pontificiae;—in his Miscell. Sacra. Jenae 1727. T. I. p. 1.

Sec. 148. *The sacrament of Penance.*

The doctrine concerning Penance, grew out of the ideas of the ancient church, and especially of *Augustine*, respecting sins *before* and *after* baptism; and out of the modifications, which the original church discipline had undergone. *Hildebert* of *Tours*, (Opp. p. 324,) mentions three parts of penance; namely, contrition of heart, confession with the lips, and satisfaction in deeds; all which have been traced back to certain passages in the writings of *John Chrysostom* and *Augustine*. These penitential acts, prescribed appropriately for the excommunicated, were transferred, by the Scholastics and the

Canonists, to sinning christians in general. They considered Penance as the medium, by which the remission of the guilt and eternal punishment—but not the temporal punishment—of sins committed subsequently to baptism, was to be sought for and obtained: and this idea gave both the matter and the form of the sacrament. It was required, that persons should confess their sins, not only to God, but also to a priest; and that they should make the satisfaction, prescribed to them; in which a distinction was made, between *attrition* and *contrition*. Satisfaction was made to consist, in fasting, prayer, and alms; to which pilgrimages and flagellations were subjoined. The absolution of the priest, was considered as a judicial act. *Gratian* and *Lombard*, however, leave it undecided, whether confession to a priest were necessary. *Innocent* the *Third*, procured for this doctrine a full establishment in the church.

Notices. Concil. Lateran; Canon XXI. Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno, proprio sacerdoti et iniunctam sibi poenitentiam studeat pro viribus implere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in Pascha eucharistiae sacramentum; nisi forte de consilio proprii sacerdotis ob aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum; alioquin et vivens ab ingressu ecclesiae arceatur et moriens christiana careat sepultura.—Si quis autem alieno sacerdoti voluerit iusta de causa sua confiteri peccata, licentiam prius postulet et obtineat a proprio sacerdote, cum aliter ille ipse non possit solvere vel ligare. Sacerdos autem sit discretus et cautus—diligenter inquirens et peccatoris circumstantiam et peccati, per quas prudenter intelligat, quale illi consilium debeat exhibere et cuiusmodi remedium adhibere, diversis experimentis utendo ad sanandum aegrotum. Caveat autem omnino, ne verbo vel signo vel alio quovis modo prodat aliquatenus peccatorem, sed si prudentiori consilio indiguerit, illud absque ulla expressione personae caute requirat; quoniam qui peccatum in poenitentiali indicio sibi detectum praesumserit revelare, non solum a sacerdotali officio

deponendum decernimus, verum etiam ad agendam poenitentiam perpetuam in arctum monasterium detrudendum.

Jo. Launoii, explicata ecclesiae traditio circa canonem Concilii Lateranensis : *Omnis utriusque sexus*—in his Opp. T. I. P. I. p. 244.

Jo. Dallaei, de poenis et satisfactionibus humanis, Libri VII; Amst. 1649. 4to.

Ejusd. de sacramentali s. auriculari confessione Latinorum, Disputatio ; Genev. 1661. 4to. Comp.

Natalis Alexandri Disputatio polemica de Confess. sacrament.—in his Hist. Eccles. T. VII.

De la frequente communion, ou les sentimens des pères, des papes et des conciles touchant l'usage des sacramens de penitence et de l'eucharistie ;—exposés par *Antoine Arnaud*, 10me ed. à Lyon 1703. 8vo.

De la penitence publique et de la préparation à la communion :—par *D. Petau*, 3d ed. Paris 1645. 4to.

La tradition de l'Eglise sur le sujet de la penitence et de la communion ;—par *Ant. Arnaud.* Par. 1634. 5th ed. 1700. 8vo.

Historia confessionis auricularis ; autore *Jac. Boileau.* Paris 1684. Compare.

Jo. Guil. Jani, Animadv. ad Historiam confess. auric.—Diss. II. Vitenb. 1716.

Jac. Hottinger, Biga exercitatt. histor. theol. de Poenitentia tum antiquioris tum Romanae ecclesiae ; Tig. 1706.

Commentarius historicus, de disciplina ecclesiae in administratione sacramenti poenitentiae ; authore *Jo. Morin.* Antw. 1682. Fol.

Sec. 149. *Remission of satisfaction. Indulgences.*

It had before been practiced, to curtail, and under special circumstances wholly to remit, the penance enjoined by the church. Afterwards, a commutation was admitted, in regard to the various kinds of penance. But it was not until the commencement of the Crusades, that the Popes conferred plenary indulgences. These

were again resorted to, in the wars against heretics; and by *Boniface* VII. they were conferred, at the Romish Jubilee A. D. 1300; and at length, they were published in various countries by the Papal envoys. To justify this species of indulgences, *Alexander Hales* invented the theory of a treasure of good works, embracing both the merits of the saints, and the infinite merit of Christ, the efficacy of which, extended not only to the temporal punishments of the present life, but likewise to those of Purgatory; and the disposal of this accumulated treasure, he supposed, was intrusted by Christ to the church. *Albert* the *Great* and *Thomas Aquinas* perfected this theory; and it was solemnly confirmed by the Pope, *Clement* VI. A. D. 1349. And yet, in the bosom of the Romish church, there were voices raised against the mischief of indulgences.

Notices. De remissione peccatorum et indulgentiarum origine;—in *L. A. Muratori,* Antiquitatt. Italiae medii aevi; T. V. p. 709.

Lettres historiques et dogmatiques, sur les Jubilés et les indulgences; par *Charles Chais;* à la Haye 1751. 3 vol. 8vo.

Ern. Aug. Bertling, Instruction concerning the Papal Jubilee and Indulgences; (Germ.) Helmst. 1749. 4to.

Fr. Rothfischers Indulgences and Jubilee; (German,) Regensb. and Wolfenbutle 1751—54. III. Vol. 4to.

Sec. 150. *Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*

The ancient custom, introduced by the very Apostles, of anointing the sick, with accompanying prayers, continued among christians, although in the earlier ages few traces of it are to be found; but no definite form of the transaction, was introduced. Subsequent to the ninth century, this anointment was called a sacrament; and it was assumed, that it ought not to be repeated; which, *Ivo* of *Chartres*, in particular, zealously maintained. But *Peter Lombard* defended the repetition of it; and the whole church afterwards followed him. The effect of

anointing the sick, was supposed to be, that it soothed the soul, and so far as was profitable, the body also, of the sick person, and imparted to him forgiveness of sin and an increase of holiness.

Notices. *Jo. Dallaei* de duobus Latinorum ex unctione sacramentis; Genev. 1659. 4to.

Jo. Launoii. de sacramento unctionis infirmorum, Liber;—in his Opp. T. I. P. I. p. 442, &c.

Sec. 151. *The Sacrament of Ordination.*

The consecration of priests, was declared to be a token of the church, by which ecclesiastical power was conferred; and it was supposed, to impress an indelible character. The question, whether heretics could give valid ordination, was left undecided by *Lombard*, and was affirmed by *Thomas*. The other inquiries made by the Scholastics, respecting the seven gradations, and the attributes of the clergy, belong rather to ecclesiastical law, than to dogmatics.

Notice. *Joan. Morini* Commentarius historicus et dogmaticus, de sacris ecclesiae ordinationibus; edit. nov. Amst. 1695. Fol.

Sec. 152. *Sacrament of Marriage.*

Marriage was held to be inferior to celibacy, and was forbidden to the clergy; and yet it was accounted a sacrament. Three good things in marriage, were stated; namely, fidelity to the vow, raising up children, and representing the union between Christ and the church. From the idea of its being a sacrament, it was inferred that, marriage being validly performed, becomes indissoluble. Here also a multitude of questions, respecting betrothments, hindrances to the union, and the relations which arise from marriage, were brought into theology, though belonging to ecclesiastical law.

Notice. The most solid examination of the views entertained of marriage in this period, is to be found in *Just.*

Henn. Böhmeri Jus ecclesiasticum Protestantium, Lib. IV. T. III et IV.

Sec. 153. *State of departed souls.*

The idea, formed in the preceding period, of a purifying fire, became established; in consequence of the reports of apparitions, which were spread abroad, and to which *Beda* and *Boniface* gave credit. There were supposed to be, five places of residence for souls. The souls that left the world, under mortal sin, and without doing penance, were thrust into hell. The souls of infants, that died without baptism, occupied a separate place, called limbus infantum. Diverse from both, was the limbus patrum, or Abraham's bosom, in which the souls of the virtuous under the Old Testament, were kept. Good souls, which needed no purgation, went immediately to heaven. The caution of *Hugo* of St. *Victor*, to leave it undecided, whether glorified saints know what transpires on the earth, and have perception of the prayers offered to them, was not imitated by the subsequent doctors. Pope *John* XXII. revived the ancient opinion, that saints are not admitted to the vision of God, immediately after death; but only at the resurrection; but the opposition of the Franciscans and the Parisian divines, obliged him to recal that opinion; and his successor, *Benedict* XII. in the year 1336, pronounced it heresy. Purgatory was appointed for those souls, which had not done penance for their minor sins. The Greeks continued, to place the commencement of this fire, at the time of the general judgment, and not in the intermediate state, or immediately after death; and it was with reluctance, and after warm opposition, that, the Council of *Florence*, A. D. 1439, they acceeded to the views of the Latins. Not only the *Waldenses* and *Wicklifites*, but also *John Wessel*, rejected the doctrine of purgatory.

Notices. Leonis Allatii, de utriusque ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis perpetua in dogmate de purgatorio consensione Liber. Romae. 1655. 4to.

Mich. Le Quien, Diss. Damascenica V; in his ed. of Opp. Damasceni, T. I. LXIII.

I. G. Chr. Hoepfner, de Origine dogmatis Roman. Pontif. de purgatorio; Halae. 1792.

Sec. 154. *Doctrine concerning the church.*

In the prevailing system of faith, the doctrine concerning the church, formed as it were the key stone. The only church, in which there is salvation, is that, which being above all danger of erring, has a right to prescribe articles of faith, and rules of life, to decide all religious controversies, and to put down heresies by coercion. Independent of every temporal power, it is competent, and is in duty bound, to resist all misuse of authority in civil governments. The Popes were acknowledged, as heads of this church; and they did not neglect, to make it an article of faith, that their decrees were to be received, unconditionally; yet without suppressing all doubts of their infallibility, and without being able, to prevent the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* from assuming the power of judging over them.

Notices. De la primauté de l'Eglise; par *D. Blondel;* Genev. 1641. Fol.

Mar. Anton. De Dominis, de republica ecclesiastica; P. I —III. 1618—22.

Petri de Marca, de concordia sacerdotii et imperii, Libri VIII; Francf. 1708.

(*F. A. Blau*,) Critical history of ecclesiastical infallibility; (in German,) Francf. 1791. 8vo.

THIRD PERIOD.

MODERN TIMES, A. D. 1517—1800.

PART I.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CHANGES IN DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

Sec. 155. *Causes leading to new modifications of theology.*

The new direction, which the minds of the learned had taken since the beginning of the fifteenth century, at first, showed itself in classical literature; but in that very way, it had influence indirectly upon theology; for it gave rise to a wider and freer range of thought, and produced a contempt for idle speculations and scholastic barbarisms. And the effect became still greater, when men of classical learning, came to apply themselves to the science of theology; when *Laurentius Valla* began to expound the New Testament, according to a better taste, and *John Reuchlin* (Capnio) revived the study of Greek and Hebrew. But all others were outdone by *Desiderius Erasmus*, who with ridicule and sound argument, made war upon ignorance and superstition, laid open the purer fountains of religious knowledge, and brought forward more liberal views, counsels and decisions. By these means, Erasmus laid the foundation for a better theology, though he neither formed nor attempted to form a system of divinity.

Notices. *Desid. Erasmi* Opera; cura *J. Clerii;* Amstel. 1703. X. vol. Fol.

(*V. Brenius*) Theology of Erasmus, or outlines of the doctrines of Christianity, from the writings of Erasmus; (in German.) Züllichau. 1794. 8vo.

Sec. 156. *Introduction of the reformation.*

Martin Luther, well read in mystic theology, and in the writings of Augustine, by his dislike of the traffic in indulgences, was led on, to a decisive attack upon the prevailing theology of the age; and through his influence, a new Christian party was established, whose opinions are expressed in the *Augsburg Confession* and in their *Apology*. Nearly at the same time, *Ulrich Zwingle* commenced and accomplished, with true Swiss independence, nearly the same thing, at Zürich. Both Protestant churches went upon the ground, of acknowledging no other authoritative source of religious instruction, but the Bible. This broad principle, swept away, at a stroke, many doctrines founded only upon tradition; and it excited to new ardor, in the study of the scriptures. Freedom from the restraining power of the hierarchy, facilitated the spread of new and better views. Zwingle, and still more Luther, gave a new aspect to many points in theology; and they had numerous pupils and assistants, who were formed upon their pattern, and after their example.

Notices. *Luther's* collected Works; (in German and Latin,) edited by *J. G. Walch.* Halle. 1740—52. XXIV. vol. 4to.

Lutheri Theologia pura sincera, ex viri divini scriptis universis maxime tamen Latinis, per omnes fidei divini articulos digesta et concinnata, per *Henricum Maium.* Francf. ad Moen. 1709. Fol.

Zwingli Opera; Tiguri 1544–45. IV. vol. Fol.—and abridged, by *Uster* and *Vögelin*; 1819---20. II. vol. 8vo. Commentarius de vera et falsa religione; Tig. 1525. 8vo.

Sec. 157. *First Protestant systems of Theology.*

Philip Melanchthon, commendable alike for his learning and his wise moderation, was the first, that supplied the want of a connected system of religious doctrines, in his Loci Communes, which he brought nearer and nearer to perfection by repeated revisions. This work was received with general approbation, and served for a guide to learned instruction, in the Lutheran church. *Martin Chemnitz* and *Victorinus Striegel* composed commentaries on it. In the Reformed church, the Institutes of *John Calvin*, were of similar merits, and obtained similar influence. *Andrew Hyperius* and *Wolfgang Musculus* were emulous followers of the example of Calvin; and from the writings of the famous biblical expositor, *Peter Martyr Vermili*, a system of theology was compiled. Besides the Protestants, other ecclesiastical parties were formed; among whom the *Unitarians* or *Socinians*, and the *Baptists*, had most influence upon systematic theology.

Notices. Phil. Melanchthonis Loci Theolog, sive Hypotyposes theolog. Viteb. 1521. and in *Herman. von der Hardt*, Hist. reformationis: Francf. 1717. Respecting the various editions of it: Essay of a literary history of the Loci Theologici of Phil. Melanchthon; (in German,) by *Ge. Theod. Strobel;* Altd. and Nuremb. 1776. 8vo. The other writings of Melanchthon, are his Opera Theolog. Vitenb. 1562—64. IV. vol. Fol. *Martini Chemnitii* Loci theolog; editi studio *Polyc. Leyseri*, Francf. 1591. 4to. and Viteb. 1590. Fol. *Victorini Strigelii* Loci theolog. studio *Christoph. Pezelii*; Neapoli Nemetum. 1582–85. IV. vol. 4to

Jo. Calvini Institutio christianae religionis; Basil. 1535. Genev. 1559. Fol. and in his Opera; Amstel. 1667. IX. vol. Fol. (*Gerdesii* Scrinium literar. T. II. p. 451.) *Andreae Hyperii* Methodus Theologiae, sive praecipuorum christianae religionis locorum communium, Libri III. Basil. 1568, 1574. 8vo. *Wolfg. Musculi* Loci communes

theolog. Bern. 1573. Fol. *Petri Martyris* Loci theolog. Basil. 1570. Fol.

Catechesis ecclesiarum Polonicarum, unum Deum patrem, illiusque filium unigenitum J. C. una cum Spiritu S. profitentium; ed. noviss. Stauropoli (Amstel.) 1684. 8vo.—recensuit, Socinianam impietam profligavit, *Ge. Lud. Oeder*; Francf. et Lips. 1739. 8vo.—Bibliotheca fratrum Polonorum; Irenopoli (Amstel.) post annum 1656. VI. vol. Fol.

Concise statement of the peculiar doctrines of F. Socinus; (in German,) by *W. C. L. Ziegler*; in *Henke's* New Magazine, Vol. IV. p. 201. Thoughts on a historical and analytical exposition of the Socinian theology; (in German,) by *Dr. Bengel*; in Süskind's Magazin. Pt. XIX. p. 133.

Sec. 158. *Reaction upon the Catholic church.*

The bold attacks of the reformers, upon the received doctrines of the church, roused the Catholics to a vigorous resistance. The Council of *Trent* condemned all innovations, and gave that statement of the Catholic faith, which has ever since been retained. The *Jesuits* came forth, as the most disputatious defenders of that system of theology; but they soon fell into contentions, with other theologians of their church. Many of these divines, adhered to the old method of teaching; and wrote comments upon Thomas Aquinas or Duns Scotus. Others endeavored to improve the method of teaching. *John Eck* attempted, to put down Melanchthon's Loci theologici, by a work of his own; and *Melchior Canus* distinguished himself, by avoiding useless subtilties, and by a purer style of writing. The Jesuits, *Robert Bellarmin* and *Martin Becan*, became famous in the conflict with the Protestants.

Notices. Concilii Tridentini canones et decreta; Rom. 1564.—(Histoire du Concile de Trent; par *Fra Paolo Sarpi*, traduite par *P. F. de Courayer;* Amst. 1736. III. vol. 4to. [Also in English, from the Italian; by *Brent*, Lond. 1620. Fol.] Istoria del concilio di Trento

—dal *Sforza Pallaviceno;* Rom. 1656—57. II. Vol. Fol. [and Latin, by *Jo. Bapt. Giattino;* Antw. 1673. Fol.]

Monumentorum ad Hist. concil. Trid. illustrandum amplissima collectio ;—studio *Jodoci le Plat;* Lovan. 1781—87. VIII Tomi 4to.) Professio fidei Tridentinae.—Catechismus ex decreto Concil. Tridentini, Pii V jussu editus ; Rom. 1566. Fol.

Jo. Eck, Enchiridion locorum communium, adversus Lutheranos; Landshuti 1525. *Doederlein's* Theol. Journal; vol. I. P. VI. p. 458—491.)—*Melch. Cani*, de Locis theologicis, Libri XII; Salamancae 1563. ed. noviss. a *Hyac. Serry;* Venet. 1759.4to.—*Roberti Bellarmini* de controversiis christianae fidei, adversus hujus temporis haereticos; e. g. Ingolst. 1601. IV. Vol. Fol. —*Martini Becani* Manuale controversiarum; Herbipol. 1623; and in his Opera; Mogunt. 1649. II. Tomi Fol.

Sec. 159. *Completion of the Lutheran system of faith.*

The numerous controversies, which arose among the followers of Luther, after his decease, threatened the whole church with confusion. To suppress these discords, and particularly to guard against the dangers, which were supposed to threaten pure Lutheranism, from Melanchthon's school, the *Formula of Concord* was drawn up; and the Book of Concord was set forth, containing, in addition to the Formula of Concord, (which determined the existing controversies with greater precision,) the Augsburgh Confession, the Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, and the two Catechisms of Luther; all which were to be the rule and measure of the genuine Lutheran creed. According to these formulas, theology was to be investigated and modelled; so that henceforth, it breathed a narrow sectarian spirit, and appeared under the guise of an intricate scholastic system, in which much use was made of the philosophy of Ramus or Aristotle. The attempts of *George Calixtus*, to introduce more freedom of discussion, and more candor

towards those of different views, met with strong opposition.

Notices. Concordia ; The Christian, revised, unanimous Confession of the hereafter named, Electoral Princes, Princes, and Orders, of the Augsburg Confession ; (in German,) Dresden 1580. Fol. and Latin, Lips. 1580, and 1584. 8vo. Also edited by *Ad. Rechenberg*, Lips. 1678. 8vo.—by *Chr. Reineccius*, Lips. 1735. 4to.—by *Ch. M. Pfaff*, Tubing. 1730. 8vo.—by *S. J. Baumgarten*, Halle 1747. 8vo.—by *J. G. Walch*, Jena. 1750. 8vo.—and by *J. A. H. Tittmann*, Lips. 1817. 8vo.—History of the origin, variations, and formation of our Protestant system of Theology, until the Formula of Concord ; (in German,) by *Jac. Gottl. Planck;* Lips. 1791—1800. VI. Vol. 8vo. —*Jo. Guil. Feuerlini*, Bibliotheca symbolica eccles. Lutheranae ; ed. *J. B. Riederer ;* 1768. 8vo.

Leonhardi Hutteri, Compendium locorum theolog. Vitenb. 1610. 8vo. and Lips. 1705.—*Ejusd.* Loci communes Theolog. Vitenb. 1619, 1653, 1661. Fol.—*Jac. Heerebrandi*, Compendium Theologiae ; Tubing. 1573. 8vo.— *Matth. Hafenrefferi*, Loci theolog. Tub. 1601.—*Joannis Gerhardi* Loci theolog. Francf. et Hamb. 1657. III. Vol. Fol.—denuo edidit, variique generis observationes adjecit, *Jo. Fr. Cotta;* Tub. 1762—89.XXII. Vol. 4to. *Casp. Er. Brochmund*, Systema universae theologiae ; Hafn. 1633. II. Vol. 4to. ed. 6 ta, Ulmae 1664. Fol.— *Ge. Calixti*, Epitome theologiae ; Goslar 1619—Systema locorum theolog.—auctore *Abr. Calovio ;* Wittenb. 1655 —77. XII. Tomi 4to.—*Jo. Fr. Koenigii*, Theologia positiva acroamatica ; Rostoch 1664. 8vo.—*Jo. Andr. Quenstedt*, Theologia didactico-polemica ; Wittenb. 1685. Fol.—*Jo. Adami Scherzeri*, Systema Theologiae XXIX definitionibus absolutum ; Lips. 1680. ed. 4ta 1704. 4to. *Jo. Guil. Baieri*, Compendium theologiae positivae ; Jenae 1686. 8vo. et 1750.—*Dav. Hollaz*, Examen theolog. acroamaticum, universam Theol. thetico-polemicam complectens ; Holm. et Lips. 1707 ; auxit *R. Tellerus* ; Holm. 1750. 4to.

Sec. 160. *Variations in doctrine, in the Reformed church.*

No general and uniform system of faith, was introduced into the *Reformed* church. Yet *Calvin's* system, prevailed in Switzerland; and in the Low Countries, it triumphed over *Jac. Arminius* and his adherents, at the Synod of *Dort*, A. D. 1618, 1619. The vanquished Arminian party, embraced some valuable theologians. The decisions at Dort, became the rule of faith for the churches of Holland; and they met with approbation, in the Swiss churches. Henceforth the form of their theology, was scholastic and polemic; and a strict adherence to the views of Calvin, and of the Synod of Dort, was the highest recommendation of any treatise written on theology.

Notices. Corpus et syntagma Confessionum fidei; ed. nova, Genev. 1654. 4to.—Acta Synodi nationalis Dordrechti habitae; Dordr. 1620. Fol. Hanov. 1620. 4to.

Simonis Episcopii, Institutionum theologicar. Libri IV; in his Opp. T. I. ed. 2. Lond. 1678. Fol. *Steph. Curcellaei*, Institutio religionis christianae; in his Opp. Theol. Amst. 1675. Fol. *Philippi a Limborch*, Theologia christiana; Amst. 1686. 4to. 1730. Fol. Basil. 1735. Fol. *Adriani a Cattenburg*, Spicilegium theologiae christ. Philippi a Limborch; 1726. Fol.

Jo. Maccovii, Loci communes theolog. Franeq. 1639. 8vo. 1650. 4to.—*Amandi Polani a Polansdorf*, Syntagma Theol. christianae; Hanov. 1610. II. vol. 4to. Genev. 1699. Fol.—*Samuelis Maresii*, Systema theologicum; Gronov. 1649. 12mo. 1673. 4to.—*Marci Fr. Wendelini*, christianae Theol. systema majus; Cassel 1656. 4to.—*Ejusd.* christianae Theol. Libri II; Hanov. 1634. 12mo.

Sec. 161. *Attempts of the Reformed, to improve their theology.*

Many theologians were not insensible to the defects of the symbolic, scholastic, theological works. *John Coccеius*, a man of eminence, but a better linguist than in-

terpreter of scripture, wished to divest theology of all its scholastic niceties, and to exhibit it in its plain biblical form; and he assumed as the basis, the idea of two dispensations. This innovation involved him with the friends to the old system, at the head of whom was *Gisbert Voetius;* and the theologians of Holland became divided into *Cocceians* and *Voetians.* About the same time, the *Cartesian* philosophy excited attention, in the low countries; and, as the Voetians assailed it, the Cocceians went over to the side of the Cartesians, and became amalgamated with them. Among them, *Herman Witsius*, *Christopher Wittich*, and *Alexander Roel*, and among their opposers, *Peter van Mastricht*, deserve the highest place. The Cocceian theology was spread in Germany, by *Frederick Adolphus Lampe* especially; and the Cartesian, by *John Clauberg* (d. 1669). The French reformed divines, as *Lewis le Blanc*, and *Moses Amyraud*, endeavored to soften some points of Calvinism; but the Swiss theologians were dissatisfied, and attempted to shut out these innovations, by the Formula consensus Helvetici A. D. 1675.

Notices. *Jo Coccii* Summa doctrinae de foedere et testamento Dei; Ludg. 1648; and in his Opp. Tom. VII. ed. Amstel. 1710. Tomi X. *Guil. Mommae*, Oeconomia testamentaria triplex; ed. auctior, Amstel. 1683. 4to. *Francisci Burmanni*, Synopsis theologiae, et speciatim oeconomiae foederum Dei; Ultraj. 1671 Franeq. 1699. 4to. *Abr. Heidani*, Corpus theologiae christianae; Lugd. Bat. 1646. 4to. *Jo. Braunii*, Doctrina foederum; Amst. 1688. Francf. 1711. 4to. *Hermanni Witsii*, Oeconomiae foederum Dei cum hominibus, Libri IV. Leov. 1677. Basil 1739. II. vol. 4to. *Fred. Adol. Lampe*, Mysteries of the Covenant of Grace in the economy of salvation; (in German,) Bremen 1712. VI. vol. 8vo. *Gisbert Voetii* Selectarum disputationum theolog. Pars I—V. Ultraj. 1648—69. *Melchioris Leydeckeri* Synopsis theologiae christ. Traj. ad Rhen. 1696. *Ejusd.* Oeconomia trium personarum in negotiis salutis huma-

nae; 1682. *Petri van Mastricht*, Theologia theoretico-practica; Amstel. 1682—84. Ultraj. 1669 II. vol. 4to.

Christoph. Wittichii, Theologia pacifica; ed. 3. Lugd. Bat. 1683. 4to. *Ejusd.* Theologia pacifica defensa; 1689. 4to. *Jo. Claubergii*, Exercitationes de cognitione Dei et nostri. Harling. 1685. 8vo. Novitatum Cartesianarum gangraena detecta; auctore *Petro van Mastricht*. Amstel. 1677.

Syntagma thesium theologicarum in academia Salmuriensi disputatarum sub praes. *Lud. Capelli, Mos. Amyraldi, Jos. Placei;* Salmari, ed 2. 1665. IV. vol. 4to. *Bened. Pictet*, Theologie chretienne; à Genève, 1721. III. vol. 4to.

J. Henr. Heideggeri, Medulla theologiae. Tiguri 1696. 4to. Medulla medullae; 1697. 8vo. Corpus theologiae christ. Tiguri 1700. II. vol. Fol. Institutiones theologiae elenchticae; authore *Franc. Turretin.* Genev. 1688. III. Partes 4to. ed. nova recognita et aucta; Lugd. Bat. 1695. III. vol. 4to.

Sec. 162. *Achievements of Spener, in regard to the Lutheran theology.*

Philip James Spener, a disciple of *John Conrad Danhauer*, was penetrated with a conviction, that the theology of that age, did not satisfy a religious mind, and that it was not suited, to form good teachers of religion. He therefore recommended banishing the multifarious subtle inquiries, the multiplied technics, and the polemic mode of treatment; and urged, in place of them, a purer biblical and practical statement of the doctrines of faith. Although sincerely devoted to the creed of the Lutheran church, he labored to abate the excessive value put upon ecclesiastical orthodoxy and symbols of faith. Violent as the opposition, he had to encounter, was, his designs were not without effect; and in the university of Halle especially, theology was taught after his manner. This was simple, and directed primarily to form a pious character; but it was deficient in distinctness of ideas, in the use of learned helps, and in philosophical discrimantion

and judgment. Yet *John Francis Buddeus* at Jena, knew how to combine the excellences of the Hallean mode of teaching, with a richness of learned acquisitions; and some Würtemburg divines also, as *Christopher Matthew Pfaff*, and *Christian Eberhard Weismann*, endeavored to simplify theological doctrines, and to teach them in a more biblical manner.

Notices. Jo. Conradi Danhaueri, Hodosophia christiana, s. Theologia positiva in certam, plenam, et cohaerentem methodum redacta; Argentor. 1649. 8vo. Lips. 1713. 4to.

Phil. Jac. Spener, Pia desideria; (1675,) Francf. 1712. 12mo. *Ejusd.* General theology, for all faithful christians, and upright theologians; (in German,) Francf. 1680. 1705. *Ejusd.* Evangelical system of faith; (in German,) Francf. 1668. *Ejusd.* Sciagraphia doctrinae fidei evangelicae; Francf. 1688. 8vo. *Joach. Just. Breithaupt*, Institutionum theologiae Libri II; Halae 1695. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Institutiones theologiae de credendis et agendis; Halae 1716—32. III. vol. 4to. *Jo. Anastas. Freylingshausen*, The foundation of theology; (in German,) Halle 1703. last ed. 1767. 8vo. *Jo. Joach. Langii*, Oeconomia salutis evangelica; Halae 1728. 1730. 8vo. *Jo. Jac. Rambach*, Dogmatic theology; (in German,) edited by *Ern. Fred. Neubauer;* Francf. 1744. II. vol. 4to.

Jo. Fr. Buddei, Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae; Lips. 1723. last ed. 1741. 4to. *Christoph. Matth. Pfaffii*, Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae et moralis; Tub. 1720. Francf. 1721. 8vo. *Christ. Eberh. Weismanni*, Institutiones theologiae exegetico-dogmaticae; Tub. 1739. 4to. *Henr. Wil. Clemm*, Complete introduction to theology; (in German,) Tubing. 1764–73. VII Vol. 4to.

Sec. 163. *Influence of the Wolfian Philosopy.*

From the chief seat of the unphilosophical Spenerian school, proceeded a new system of philosophy, derived by *Christian Wolf*, from the abstruse ideas of *Godfrey William von Leibnitz*. The pietistic and the anti-pietistic theologians, apprehending the overthrow of all religion

from it, rose in opposition against it; but they were unable to put it down, or to prevent its being applied to theology. From the Wolfian philosophy, theology derived a mathematical form, little suited to its nature; yet it was improved by a more solid arrangement, and by clearer definitions. The doctrines of faith, were treated according to Wolfian principles, not only in the Lutheran, but likewise in the Reformed churches: and *James Siegmund Baumgarten* caused this mode of teaching, to be admitted into Halle. Still there were theologians, who, without taking sides either for or against the Wolfian party, endeavored to profit by what was good in both.

Notices. (*Isra. Gottl. Canzii*, Usus philosophiae Leibnitianae et Wolfianae in Theologia; Francf. 1733. II Tomi, 8vo. *Ejusd.* Consensus philosophiae Wolfianae cum Theologia; Francf. 1737. 8vo.) *Jac. Carpovii*, Oeconomia salutis N. T. s. Theologia revelata dogmatica methodo scientifica adornata; 1737–65. IV vol. 4to. *Joh. Gustav. Reinbeck's* Reflections on the Augsburg Confession; (in German,) Berlin. 1731–41. IV vol. 4to. continued by *Isr. Gottl. Canz;* Vol. V—X. Berlin 1743–47. and by *J. Pet. Ahlward;* 1742–48. VII Parts, or II Vol. 4to. *Geo. Henr. Ribovii*, Institutiones theolog. dogmat. Gotting. 1741. 8vo. *Pet. Reusch*, Introductio in theologiam revelatam; Jenae. 1744. 8vo. *Isr. Gottl. Canzii*, Compendium theologiae purioris; Tub. 1752. 8vo. *Jo. Ern. Schubert*, Introductio in theologiam revelatam; Jenae 1749. *Ejusd.* Institutiones theologiae dogmat. Jenae 1753. *Ejusd.* Compendium theol. dogmat. Helmst. et Halae 1760. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Institutiones theologiae polemicae; Jen. et Lips. 1760–61. IV vol. 8vo. *Siegm. Jac. Baumgarten*, Theses theologicae; Halae 1746, 1767. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Evangelical System of faith; (in German,) edited by *J. S. Semler;* Halle 1759–60. III vol. 4to. *Ejusd.* Examination of theological controversies; (in German,) edited by *J. S. Semler;* Halle 1762–64. III vol. 4to.

Dan. Wyttenbach, Tentamen theologiae dogmaticae methodo scientifica pertractatae; Bern. 1741–42. III vol. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Compendium theologiae dogmat. et moralis;

Francf. 1754. 8vo. *Henr. Guil. Bernsau*, Theologia dogmat. methodo scientifica pertractata; Lips. 1755. II vol. 8vo. *Joh. Fred. Stapfer*, The foundation of true religion; (in German,) Zurich 1746–53. XII Vol. 8vo. Hersfeld. 1756. III Vol. 4to. *Ejusd.* Institutiones theologiae polemicae; Tuguri 1745–47. V vol. 8vo.

Jo. Laur. Moshemii, Elementa theologiae; ed. 2. Norimb. 1764. II vol. 8vo.

Sec. 164. *Protestant theology in countries beyond Germany.*

In England, theological controversies were carried on, with uncommon vehemence, and being connected with political discords, produced dreadful ferments in the public mind. The effects of this excitement, were threefold. Some—(the *Deists)* rejected christianity in general, and confined themselves to mere natural religion. Others were disposed, to regard christianity as a mere matter of feeling, and assumed as their directory an internal light—(the *Quakers*). Others again, had the conviction, that the creed of the church and symbols of faith, were of little consequence, and that men ought to hold fast only the essential and the practical doctrines of Christianity—(the *Latitudinarians*). The toleration, granted towards the close of the seventeeth century, gave these parties room for freer action, and the friction of their collisions produced clearer views, and a more active spirit of investigation. Yet the spirit of the English theologians, finding less satisfaction in elaborating systems of theology, employed itself, for the most part, in the discussion of particular points, or in ranging at large on theological subjects, with at least, freedom of thought. In Switzerland also, the former rigorous orthodoxy was relaxed; and at Geneva in particular, the ancient seat of Calvinism, *James Vernet* preached, not the Calvinistic system, but only the simple truths of christianity. These writings of foreign divines, were read in Germany, and were there translated. The works also of Socinian and Arminian writers, were read with less aversion, than formerly.

Notices. *Anthony Collins*, Discourse on free-thinking; occasioned by the rise and growth of a sect, called Free-Thinkers; Lond. 1713. 8vo. *Phileleutheri Lipsiensis* (Richard Bentley), Remarks upon a late discourse of free-thinking; 1713. (also in French. ed. 8. Amst. 1736. 8vo.) Theologiae verae christianae Apologia; a *Roberto Barclaio;* Roterod. 1676. 4to. (also German, 1740. 8vo.) The principles and practices of certain moderate divines abusively called Latitudinarians; III Parts; Lond. 1671. 8vo. (*Arthur Bury*) Latitudinarius orthodoxus; Lond. 1697. 12mo.

Thomae Burnet, de fide et officiis christianorum, Liber posthumus; Lond. 1727. revised and enlarged, by *W. A. Teller;* Halle 1786. 8vo. A complete body of divinity, by *Thom. Stackhouse;* Lond. 1729. (also in German; by *Fried. Eberh. Rambach;* Rostock. 1755–64. VII vol. 8vo. The far more important works on particular topics, belong to the history of particular doctrines.

Instruction chretienne; par *Jaques Vernet*, à Geneve. 1754. V tomes. 8vo. (also in German,) Berlin, 1754–55. V Parts, or II vol. 8vo.

Sec. 165. *New formation of the Protestant theology.*

Historians of it. Prize question of the Directors of the Universal Literary Journal, A. D. 1788. (*Gebh. Ulr. Brastberger's*) Narrative and examination of the principal changes, made in the learned statements of dogmatic theology, among the Protestants of Germany, especially in the second half of the present century; (in German,) Halle, 1790. 8vo. Essay of a historical developement of the causes and occasions, which have produced a new state of protestant dogmatics; (German,) in *Stäudlin's* Contributions to the philosophy and history of religion. Vol. IV. p. 1—50. Lubeck, 1798. Practical history of theology and religion, in the Protestant church, during the second half of the 18th century; (in German,) by *J. Aug. Tittmann.* Vol. I. Breslau 1805. 8vo. The illumination of modern divines, in christian theology, from A. D. 1760, to A. D. 1805; (in German; by *Fuhrmann,*) Vol. I. Lips. 1807. 8vo.

The progress of human science, of biblical criticism and hermeneutics, and of historical theology, and the increased philosophical industry of divines, who cast off the shackles of the church creed, being favored by the increased freedom of the pulpit and the press; led on to a very considerable change in dogmatic theology, which at first, under *J. Aug. Ernesti*, *Dav. Heilmann*, and *J. Dav. Michaelis*, extended only to its form and unessential definitions(A), but soon after, affected the substance itself. *W. Abr. Teller. Gotthilf Sam. Steinbart, J. Aug. Eberhard*, and *J. S. Semler*, were especially active, in producing this change(B). They were aided, by the less learned and discreet, *Jo. Bernh. Basedow*, and *Charles Fr. Bahrdt*(C); and the German Universal Library (Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek) cooperated powerfully, to bring the old system under ridicule, and open the way for the new views. Against these assaults, however, the established theology found many defenders(D). Without joining either party, altogether, *Jo. Christ. Doederlein*, and *Sam. Fred. Nath. Morus*, found their theological treatises receiving much approbation(E). Biblical theology, likewise had its writers(F); and in the popular statement of religious doctrines, *Fred. Wilh. Jerusalem* stood conspicuous(G).

Notices. A. *Jo. Dav. Michaelis*, Compendium theologiae dogmat. Gotting. 1760: and in German, Gott. 1784. *Jo. Dav. Heilmanni*, Compendium theol. dogmat. Gott. 1761, 1774. *Ern. Jac. Danovii*, Theologiae dogmat. Institutio; Jenae 1772, 1776. *Jo. Gottl. Töllner*, Miscellaneous papers; (in German.) Francf. on Oder, 1767–70. II. vol. *Ejusd.* Theological Inquiries; (in German,) Vol. I. and Vol. II. P. I. Riga 1772–74. (*Ejusd.* System of Dogmatic theology; (in German,) II. Vol. Nurenb. 1775.)

B. *W. A. Teller's* Elements of the Christian faith; (in German,) 1764. 8vo. *Jo. Fred Gruneri*, Institutt. theol. dogmat. Libri III.; Halae 1777. *Ejusd.* Practical Introduction to the religion of the H. Script. (in German,) Halle 1773. *Jo. Aug. Eberhard*, New apology of Socrates, and on the salvation of the Heathen; (German,)

Berlin 1772. new ed. 1778. II. vol. 8vo. *Godfr. Sam. Steinbart's* System of pure philosophy, or the christian doctrine of salvation ; (German,) Züllich. 1778. ed. 3. 1786. (*J. A. Sixt,* Examination of the so called System of pure Philosophy ; (German,) Altd. and Nurenb. 1779 –80. II Parts. The philosophical Christianity of Counsellor Steinbart, freely investigated, by a practical theologian ; (German,) Lips. 1792.) *Ejusd.* Philosophical conversations, for a fuller elucidation of the doctrine of salvation ; (German,) Züll. 1781–86. III Parts. *J. S. Semleri,* Institutio ad doctrinam christ. liberaliter discendam ; Halae 1774. *Ejusd.* Essay of a more liberal manner of teaching theology ; for the elucidation and confirmation of his Latin work ; (German,) Halle 1777, 8vo. (*J. A. Starck,*) Free remarks on Christianity ; (Germ.) ed. 2. Berl. 1782. (The Free remarks on Christianity, examined : by *Tob. Gottf. Hegelmaier ;* Tub. 1781–82. III Vol. 8vo.) *Sam. Mursinna,* Compendium theologiae dogmat. Halae 1777.

C. *C. F. Bahrdt,* Essay of a biblical System of dogmatics ; (Germ.) Gotha and Lips. 1769—70. II. Vol. 8vo. —*Ejusd.* Letters on systematic theology ; (Germ.) Erf. 1770. II. vol. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Systema theologiae Lutheranae orthodoxum, cum brevi notatione dissentientium. Halae 1785. 8vo.—*J. Bernh. Basedow,* Philalethia. New views taken of the truths and the religion of reason, as far as the boundaries of credible revelation ; (German,) Altona 1764, II. vol. 8vo.—Essay of a candid system of theology, according to private judgments ; (German,) Berlin 1766.—*Bernherd of Nordalbingden,* Legacy for some persons ; (German,) Dessau 1774.

D. *Jo. Benj. Corpzov,* Liber doctrinalis theologiae purioris ; Brunsw. 1767.—*Chr. W. Fr. Walchii.* Breviarum theologiae dogmat. Got. 1775.—*Ge. Fred. Seiler,* Theologia dogmat. polemica ; Erlang. 1774. ed. 3. 1789.—*Jo. Pet. Miller,* Theol. dogmat. Compendium ; Lips. 1785. *Eberh. Dan. Stosch,* introductio in theol. dogmat. Francf. ad Viadr. 1778. *Ejusd.* Institutiones theol. dogmat. ibid. 1779. *Sam. Endemanni,* Institutiones theol. dogmat. Hanov. 1777. II. Vol. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Compendium theol. dogmat. Francf. 1782. ed. 2. cura *J. A. Arnoldi ;* Han. 1790.

E. *Jo Christoph. Doederlein*, Institutio theologi christiani in capitibus religionis theoreticis, temporibus nostris accommodata; Altorf. 1780. ed. 6ta 1799. II. Vol. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Summa institutionis &c. Norimb. 1782.—*Ejusd.* Religious Instruction; (German,) Vol. I—IV. and continuation, by *G. Ch. Junge.* Vol. V—XII. Altorf. and Nurenb. 1785—1803. 8vo.—*S. F. N. Mori*, Epitome theologiae christianae; Lips. 1789. ed. 4. 1799.—*Ejusd.* Commentarius exeget. histor. in suam theol. christ. Epitomen; ed. *C. A. Hempel*, Lips. 1797—98. II. Vol. 8vo.

F. *Gotth. Traugott Zachariae*, Biblical Theology; (in German,) Gott. and Kiel. 1771—75. IV Vol. continued by *Vollbroth*, ed. 3. 1786. V. Vol. 8vo.—*W. Fred. Hufnagel's* Manual of biblical theology; (in German,) vol. I. and vol. II. P. I. Erlang. 1785—89.—*Chr. F. Ammon's* Biblical Theology; (German,) Erlang. 1792. ed. 2. 1801—2. III. Vol. 8vo.—The spirit of original Christianity; (in German,) by *J. A. Eberhard;* Halle 1807—8. III. Vol. 8vo.

G. *Jo. Fred. W. Jerusalem's* Reflections on the principal truths of religion; (in German,) vol. I. Brunsw. 1768. vol. II. P. I—IV. 1772—79. The Parts of continuation, in his posthumous writings; Brunsw. 1692—93. IV. Vol. 8vo.—*Godfr. Less*, Theory of the christian religion, or Essay of a practical dogmatic; (in German,) Gotting. 1779. also, under the title of Manual, of the theory of Christianity, for people of education; ed. 3. 1789. —*J. A. Hermes*, Manual of religion; (in German,) 5th ed. improved; Berlin 1797. 8vo.—To quiet my soul, what must I believe? what can I expect, among the complicated opinions of the learned?—answered by a feeble old man, on the borders of the grave (*J. Fr. Jacobi*); (in German,) Hanov. 1790.—Result of my more than 50 year's reflection on the doctrine of Christ; (in German, by *Dan. Hen. Purgold,*) ed. 2. Lips. 1788.—*Jo. Jac. Griesbach's* Introduction to the study of popular dogmatics; (in German,) Jena 1779. ed. 4. 1789.—*A. H. Niemeier's* Popular and practical theology; (in German,) Halle 1792. ed. 5. 1806.—*Ejusd.* Letters to christian Ministers; (in German,) ed. 2. 1803.

Sec. 166. *Influence of the Kantean philosophy.*

History of it. (*Flügge,*) Essay of a historic and critical representation of the effects of the Kantean philosophy, thus far, on all the branches of scientific and practical theology ; (in German,) Hanov. 1796–98. II vol. 8vo. The state of dogmatics, in the Lutheran church, since the time of Morus; (in German,) by *Aug. Bas. Manitius ;* Witemb. 1806. 8vo.

The Kantean philosphy, which shook the foundations of the previous religious systems, and aimed to establish faith in supersensible things, directly on practical reason; was commended, by many divines, as the surest means of securing the christian doctrines, against the assaults of unbelief, and the mazes of superstition. But it was soon felt, that its union with christianity, was compulsory. Biblical theology, however, was not neglected ; and greater attention than ever, was paid to the history and literature of theology. The great dissimilarity in the first principles, assumed by the theologians, became more and more visible. Some divines endeavored, to defend the leading points of the old theology. Others followed an eclectic rationalism ; to which they either accommodated the doctrines of the bible, or they exhibited the latter, along with the principles of the former, without concealing the discordance between them. The philosophy of *Schelling* also, which identified the creation with the Creator, was applied to the erection of new systems of dogmatics. The changes in the German theology, likewise, produced some influence on the churches of Holland.

Notices. Religion within the boundaries of pure reason ; (in German,) by *Imman. Kant ;* Konigsb. 1794.—*C. Fr. Stäudlin's* Thoughts for a critique upon the system of the christian religion ; (German,) Got. 1791, 8vo.—On the value of the critical philosophy, especially in a religious and moral view, and the use and abuse of it, in the theological sciences ; (German,) in *Stäudlin's* Contributions to the history and philosophy of religion ; vol. III. IV. V.—*J. Henr. Tieftrunk,* Estimate of the

Protestant system of Christianity, according to the principles of religious criticism ; (German,) Berlin 1791–96. III vol. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Dilucidationes ad theoreticam religionis christ. partem; Berlin 1793. II vol.—*Chr. Fred. Ammon's* Sketch of a scientific work on practical theology ; (in German,) vol. I. P. I, II. Gotting. 1798.—*J. W. Schmid*, On the nature of the christian religion, and the proper mode of treating it, both as instruction for mankind, and as a science ; (in German,) Jena 1797. 8vo.

On the inconsistency of the dogmatic system, to which the high court-preacher Reinhard gives assent; and the consistency of the rationalism, that admits a revelation ; (in German,) 1811. 8vo.

Leuchte (*J. G. S.*) Critique of the latest inquiries respecting rationalism and belief in revelation ; (in Germ.) Lips. 1812. 8vo.

Letters on rationalism: Designed to correct the fluctuating and dubious decisions, passed on that subject, in the recent disputes about consistency ; (in German,) Aachen (Rastatt). 1813. 8vo.

Tittmann (*J. A.*) On Supranaturalism, Rationalism, and Atheism ; (in German,) Lips. 1816. 8vo.—*L. A. Kaehler*, Supernaturalism and Rationalism, in their common origin, their disagreement, and ultimate unity. A word for satisfying all those, who are undecided, whether they should believe in order to know, or know in order to believe ; (in German,) Lips. 1818. 8vo.

(*Ge. Lor. Bauer's*) Theology of the Old Testament, or Summary of the religious ideas of the Hebrews ; (in German.) Lips. 1796. 1801.—*Ejusd.* Biblical theology of the New Testament; (in German,) Lips. 1800, 1802. IV vol.—*Ejusd.* Breviarium theologiae biblicae ; Lips. 1803.—*Kaiser*, (*G. P. C.*) Biblical theology, or Judaism and Christianity ; (in German,) Erlang. 1813–14. II vol. 8vo.—Commentarii histor. decretorum religionis christiane et formulae Lutheriae ; scripsit *Ch. Dan. Beck;* Lips. 1801. 8vo.—*C. G. Brettschneider's* Essay of a systematic developement of all the opinions advanced in dogmatics, according to the symbolical books of the

evangelical Lutheran church ; (in German,) Lips. 1805. improved ed. 1819. 8vo.

Gottl. Chr. Storr, Doctrinae christianae pars theoretica; Stuttg. 1793.—*Ejusd.* Elements of christian theology; in German from the Latin, with additions, by *C.C. Flatt.* Stuttg. 1803. 2d improved and enlarged ed. vol. I. 1813. 8vo. (Also made English, by *S. S. Schmucker ;* Andover 1826. II vol. 8vo.)—*Fr. V. Reinhard.* Lectures on dogmatics, with literary additions ; (in German,) published by *Imm. Berger* ; Amberg and Sulzb. 1801. ed. 2. 1806; and with new literary additions, by *H. A. Schott* ; 4th improved ed. 1818. 8vo.—Epitome theologiae christ. e Reinhardi acroasibus descripta ; a *P. Ge. Chr. Höpfner ;* Lips. 1805.—Magazine for christian dogmatics and moral theology ; (in German,) published by *J. Fr. Flatt,* and continued (since Pt. 9,) by *Fred. Gottl. Süskind ;* Tub. 1796 &c. XIV Parts. 8vo.—System of christian dogmatics, laid down according to the theology of the Lutheran church ; (in German,) by *Jo. Chr. W. Augusti ;* Lips. 1809.

H. A. Schott, Epitome theologiae christianae dogmaticae ; Lips. 1811. 8vo.

The religious instructions of the Bible, considered with reference to our spiritual wants ; (in German,) by *J. L. Ewald ;* Stuttg. and Tub. 1812. II vol. 8vo.

Manual of the theology of the evang. Lutheran church; (in German,) by Dr. *C. G. Brettschneider ;* Lips. 1814–18. II vol. 8vo.

Jo. Chr. Rud. Eckermann, Compendium theologiae christ. theoret. biblico-historicae ; ed. 2. Altonae 1792. —*Ejusd.* Manual for the systematic study of the christian faith ; (in German,) Altona 1801–3. IV vol. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Theological contributions; (Germ.) Altona 1791–97. VI vol.—*Hen. Ph. Con. Henke,* Lineamenta institutt. fidei christ. historico-criticarum; Helmst. 1793. ed. 2. 1795. *Ejusd.* Mag. for religious philosophy, exegesis, and church history ; (in German,) Helmst. 1794 &c. VI vol.—*Ejusd.* New Magazin ; (German). Helmst. 1797 &c. VI vol.—*Ejusd.* Museum for religious science, in all its extent ; (in German,) Magd. 1803–07. III vol. 8vo.—

Critique of the ancient and modern doctrines of the christian church; (in German,) by *G. C. Cannabich;* Zerbst and Lips. 1798 ed. 3. 1805.—*Gottl. Denker* (Sintenis), Last revision of the faith of the church; (in German,) 1799. 8vo.—*Char. Lud. Nitzsch,* De revelatione religionis externa eademque publica; Lips. 1808. —The foundation of theology; (in German,) by *Gottl. Schlegel;* vol. I. Riga 1806.

Dogmatics and dogmatic history; (in German,) by *C. Fred. Stäudling;* Gott. 1799. II vol.—*Ejusd.* Elements of dogmatics and dogmatic history; (in German,) ed. 2. Gotting. 1809.—*I. Ern. Christ. Schmid's* Elements of christian dogmatics; (in German,) Giess. 1800.—*Ejusd.* Christian theology; (in German,) Giess. and Darmst. 1808.—*Chr. Fr. Ammon,* Summa theol. christ. Gotting. 1803, ed. 2, 1808, ed. 3, Lips. 1816, also in German, 1805.—*Ejusd.* Full instruction in the christian faith, designed for the friends of evangelical truth; (in German,) vol. I. P. I, II. Erlang. 1807, 1808.—*I. G. Herder,* Dogmatics; collected from his writings, with literary and critical notes; (in German,) Jena 1805.

Elements of christian dogmatics, presented in a historical developement of the same; (in German,) by Dr. *W. M. L. De Wette;* Berl. 1813–16. II vol. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* On religion and theology: Elucidations to his elements of dogmatics; (in German,) Berl. 1815. 8vo.

Institutiones theologiae christ. dogmaticae. Scholis suis scripsit, addita singulorum dogmatum historia et censura, *J. A. L. Wegscheider;* ed. 2. Halae, 1817. 8vo.

Thologumena, s. Doctrinae de religione christ. ex natura Dei perspecta capita potiora, scholis dicavit *Car. Daub;* Heidelb. 1806.—*Ejusd.* Introduction to the study of christian dogmatics; (in German.) Heidelb. 1810.—*Fred. Henr. Christ. Schwarz,* Sciagraphia theologiae dogmaticae; Heidelb. 1808.—*Ejusd.* Christianity considered in its truth and divinity; (in German,) vol. I. Heidelb. 1808.—*Ejusd.* Outline of Protestant ecclesiastical dogmatics; ed. 2. altered and done into German; Heidelb. 1816, large 8vo.

Pars theoretica religionis christianae—in compendium redegit; *Herm. Muntinghe;* 1800–1, 8vo.

Compendii theologiae christ. ordo et argumentum : Pars theoretica. Ad usum discipulorum ; edidit *Jo. van Voorst ;* Lugd. 1806. 8vo.

Christian theology, according to the wants of the present time ; (in Dutch,) by *J. H. Regenbogen ;* Workum, 1811. 8vo. (very lax !)

J. A. Lotze. Monogrammata theologiae theoreticae, in scholae suae usum ; Harderov. 1817. 8vo.

Sec. 167. *The theology of other churches.*

The established doctrines of the Catholic church, are professedly unchangable ; and can therefore admit of no essential alterations. And yet theology was taught with some peculiarities, by each order of Monks ; and the contest between the Jansenists and Jesuits, in particular, gave the Catholic divines much employment. For the most part, the old scholastic form of doctrine continued ; yet in France, from about the seventeenth century, attempts were made, to purge away many of the useless subtilties ; and *Bossuet* endeavored, to make its deviations from the Protestant views, less striking. The free remarks of *Francis de Courayer*, on improving theology, were not attended to. With better success, the Catholic divines of Germany, in modern times, have begun to treat the theology of their church, more lucidly and practically ; and in this, they have condescended to make use of the writings of Protestants(A). The Greek church has had no dogmatic writers, except *Theophanes Procopowitsch* and *Platon*(B). Among the *Unitarians* or Socinians also, a few works on dogmatics have appeared(C).

Notices. A. *Fran. Suarez*, Commentatt. et disputatt. in Summam theologiae Sti Thomae ; Mogunt. 1619–29. XIX vol. Fol. *Jo. Bapt. du Hamel*, Theologia speculativa et practica, juxta SS. Patrum dogmata pertractata ; Par. 1691. VII vol. 8vo. Exposition de la foi catholique ; par *Jaque Ben. Bossuet ;* Par. 1672. 12mo. Theologia dogmat. et moralis, auctore *Natal Alexandro ;* Paris 1703. II. vol. Fol. *Antonii Tournelli*, Praelectiones

theologicae ; Paris 1725–30. XVI vol. 8vo. Examen des defauts theologiques ; (par *F. de Courayer*,) Amst. 1744. II vol. 8vo. *Jo. Laur. Berti*, Theologia histor. dogmat. scholastica ; Venet. 1760, &c. X vol. Fol. And, abridged, Bamb. 1773. V vol. 8vo. *Renati Billuart*, Summa Sti Thomae hodiernis academiarum moribus accommodata ; Leod. 1746–51. XIX Tomi. 8vo. and Wirceb. 1758. III vol. Fol. *Ejusd.* Summa summae Sti Thomae ; s. Compendium theologiae ; Leod. 1746. VI vol. 8vo. *Petri Mariae Gazzaniga*, Praelectiones theolog. ed. 3. Viennae 1775. IV vol. 8vo. *Simpert Schwarzhüber*, Catholic christian manual ; (in German,) ed. 3. Salzb. 1791. IV vol. 8vo. *Steph. Wiest*, Institutiones theologicae ; ed. 2. Ingolst. 1788–89. VI vol. 8vo. *Ejusd.* Institt. theol. dogmat. ib. 1791. II vol. ed. 2. Landshut 1817. 8vo. *Rened. Stattler*, Theologiae theoret. tractatus ; Eustad. 1776–79. IV Tomi. *Petri Tamburini*, Praelectiones in acad. Ticinensi ; Ticini 1787. 8vo. Manual of the christian religion ; (in German,) by *Ildefons Schwarz ;* ed. 2. Bamb. and Würzb. 1797. III vol. 8vo. *Engelberti Klüpfel*, Institutt. theologiae dogmaticae ; ed. 2. Viennae 1802–3. II vol. *Bernh. Galura*, Latest theology of christianity ; (in German,) Augsb. 1800–3. V vol. 8vo. ed. 2, Augsb. 1818. VI vol. 8vo. *Dobmayer*, (*C. D. M.*) Systema theol. catholicae; Solisbaci 1813. IV Tomi 8vo. cum append. Candid representation of theology, under the idea of the Kingdom of heaven ; or latest catholic dogmatics, according to the wants of the present age ; (in German,) by Dr. *Fred. Brenner ;* Bamb. and Würzb. 1815–18. III. vol. 8vo.

B. *Theophanis Procopowitz*, Christiana orthodoxa theologia ; Regiomonti 1773–75. V vol. 8vo. *Platon's* Orthodox doctrine, or short summary of christian theology ; (in German,) Riga 1770 ; (also, English, in The present state of the Greek church ; by *Rob. Pinkerton ;* New-York 1815. 12mo.) See also, Reflections on the doctrine and the spirit of the orthodox churches ; (in French,) by *Alexander de Stoundza ;* and thence German, by *August. von Kotzebue ;* Lips. 1817. 8vo.

C. *Jo. Volkelii*, de vera religione, Libri V ; quibus praefixus

est *Jo. Crellii* Tractatus de Deo et ejus attributis ; Racov. 1630. 4to. *Sam. Crelli,* Cogitationes de primo et secundo Adamo ; s. de ratione salutis per illum amissae, per hunc recuperata ; Amst. 1700. 8vo. (*Georgii Markos,*) Summa universae theologiae, secundum Unitarios ; Claudiop. 1777. 8vo. See Archive for ancient and modern church history ; (in German,) edited by *C. F. Stäudlin* and *H. C. Tzschirner ;* vol. I. P. I. No. 3. The author of this piece, was supposed to be *George Markos ;* but it was published from a manuscript work of *Michael Lombardsz Abrahami,* who was superintendent of the Unitarians in Transylvania, from A. D. 1737, to A. D. 1758. See the above named Archive, vol. IV. P. I.

PART II.

HISTORY OF PARTICULAR DOCTRINES.

CHAPTER I.

THE FOUNDATION OF RELIGION GENERALLY, AND ESPECIALLY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

Historians. J. Alb. Fabricii, Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum, qui veritatem religionis christ. adversus Atheos, Epicureos, Deistas s. Naturalistas, Idololatras, Judaeos et Muhammedanos, asseruerunt ; Hamb. 1725. 4to. An appendix thereto, annexed to *Jo. Ant. Trinius,* Dictionary of Free-thinkers ; (in German,) Lips. &c. 1758. 8vo. The history and spirit of scepticism, especially in regard to morals and religion ; (in German,) by *Ch. Fr. Stäudlin ;* Lips. 1794. II vol. 8vo.

Sec. 168. *Doctrine concerning God.*

The belief of a God was commonly, either assumed, or supported on the old and well known grounds, when *des Cartes* attempted to establish it with new arguments. Moreover the theologians were roused from their inactivity, and made sensible of the danger in which the foun-

dation of their system stood, by the efforts of two persons. *Thomas Hobbes* (d. 1679) seemed, in general, to undermine religion; and to rank the Creator among sensative beings. *Benedict Spinoza* (d. 1677), in a more systematic manner, brought forward a connected and self-consistent pantheism. Among the numerous writers, who appeared against these two men, the most distinguished were *Henry Morus* (d. 1687), *Ralph Cudworth* (d. 1688), and *Samael Clarke* (d. 1729). The philosophy of *John Locke*, which deduced all knowledge from experience, and which met great approbation in England, and was received also in France; contrary to the designs of its author, was so appllied, as to render all belief of supersensible truths, uncertain. *Christian Wolf*, endeavored to resist infidelity, by a more acute statement of the argument derived from the principle of causation; and *Hermann Sam. Reimarus* presented the argument in a more intelligible form, and defended it against the objections of *Maupertuis*. Also *Moses Mendelsohn* obtained high commendation, by the clearness with which he stated the evidence of the being of a God; and during the same time, essays proving the being of God, from the necessity of a first cause, became more numerous than ever.

Notices. Thomas Hobbes, Elementa philosophica, de cive; Amstel. 1669. 12mo. *Ejusd.* Leviathan; London 1651. *Bened. Spinoza*, Tractatus theologico-politicus; Hamb. 1670. *Bened. Spinoza*, Opp. posthuma; Amst. 1677. 4to. *Ejusd.* Opera; curavit *H. E. G. Paulus*; Jenae 1802–3. II vol. 8vo. *Ralph Cudworth*, Intellectual system of the universe; ex Anglico vertit et illustravit *J. Laur. Moshemius*; ed. 2. Lugd. Bat. 1773. II vol. 4to. *Sam. Clarke*, On the existence and attributes of God, the duties of natural religion, and the truth of the christian religion; (French from the English,) Amst. 1756. III vol. 8vo. *Herm. Sam. Reimarus*, Treatises on the principal truths of natural religion; with notes by *J. A. H. Reimarus*; (in German,) ed. 6. Hamb. 1791. *Moses Mendelsohn's* Morning hours; (in German,) vol. I.

Berlin 1785. (Examination of Mendelsohn's Morning hours; (in German,) by *Lud. Hen. Jakob;* Lips. 1786.) *W. Derham's* Physico-Theology; German from the English. Hamb. 1764. *Ejusd.* Astro-Theology; Hamb. 1765. *Bernhard Nieuwetyt,* Contemplations on the universe; (English from the Latin, III vol. 8vo.) German from the Latin, by *I. A. Segner;* Jena 1747. 4to. *Charles Bonnet,* Contemplations of nature; (English from the French.) German from the French, by *J. Dan. Titius;* ed. 4. Lips. 1783.

Sec. 169. *More recent history of this doctrine.*

The spread of a superficial French philosophy, which would admit nothing for true, beyond the reach of the senses; appeared to be even more dangerous to religious faith, than the artful scepticism, with which *David Hume* assailed it. Yet the last occasioned *Immanuel Kant,* to subject the whole subject of our knowledge of supersensible objects to a severer criticism; the result of which was, that he pronounced all theoretical proof of the being of God, inadequate; and allowed the practical evidence, to be the only valid evidence. Respecting this decision of Kant, the suspicion was early expressed, that it led, or might lead, to atheism; and the utterance of this suspicion became still louder, when *G. Fichte* would not admit a moral government of the world, and denied the existence and substance of God. The recent philosophy of *Schelling,* extols pantheism, though with some modifications, as the summit of all divine wisdom, and looks down with pity, on all who think otherwise.

Notices. Systeme de la nature, ou des loix du monde physique et du monde moral; par. *M. Mirabaud;* à Londres 1770. II vol. 8vo. also in German, 1783. (Observations sur le livre intitulé; Systeme de la nature, &c. par. M. *Jean de Castillon*; Berlin 1771. Reflexions philosophiques sur le Systeme &c. par M. *Holland;* à Neufchatel. ed. 2. 1773.) *David Hume,* Dialogues concerning natural religion; Lond. 1779. in German, with a Dialogue on Atheism, by *Ern. Platner*; Lips. 1781.

8vo. *Immanuel Kant*, Critique on pure reason; (in German,) ed. 3. Riga 1790. *Ejusd.* Critique on the judging power; (in German,) Berlin 1793. *Ejusd.* Religion within the boundaries of mere reason; (in German,) ed. 2. Konigsb. 1794. *G. Ch. Storr's* Remarks on the religious doctrines of Kant; a German translation by *Süskind*; Tub. 1794. (*Schulze's*) Some remarks on Kant's philosophichal religious doctrines; (in German,) Kiel. 1795. Theological contributions; (in German,) by *J. Ch. Rud. Eckermann;* vol. III. P. III. and vol. IV. (*C. F. Stäudlin,*) Prolusio, qua auctor ipse Philosophiae criticae a suspicione Atheismi vindicatur; Gott. 1799. 4to. On the ground of our belief of a divine government of the world; by *Fichte;* and Developement of the idea of religion; by *Forberg*; (both in German,) and both in Fichte's and Niethammer's Philosoph. Journal. A. D. 1799. vol. II. p. 249 &c. *Fr. W. I. Schelling's* Bruno; or on the divine, and the natural, first principle of things; (in German,) Berl. 1802. *Ejusd.* Philosophy and religion; (in German,) Tub. 1804. *Ejusd.* Philosophical writings; (Germ.) vol. I. Landshut 1809. p. 399—511. *Fr. Henr. Jacobi*, On divine things, and the revelation of them; (in German,) Lips. 1811. 8vo. *Fr. W. I. Schelling*, Monument of the Scripture concerning divine things, &c. (in German,) Tubing. 1812. 8vo.—Against Schelling: *Fr. Gottl. Süskind*, Examination of Schelling's doctrine, concerning God, creation of the world, freedom, moral good and evil; (in German,) Tubing. 1812. 8vo.

The more ancient proofs of the being of God, were also brought forward again, in this period; in the following works:

(*L. von Crell,*) Pyrrho and Philalethes; or, does Scepticism lead to truth and calm decision? (in German, edited by *Reinhard*; ed. 3. Sulzbach 1813. 8vo. *J. F. Abel's* Detailed statement respecting the evidence of the being of God; (in German,) Heilbron 1817. 8vo. *J. F. Dahlenburg*, Philosophy and religion of nature; (in German,) Berlin 1797–98. III. Vol. 8vo.

Sec. 170. *Doctrine of Providence.*

The opposers of religion have always appealed to the

existence of evil and misery in the world, as a ground for questioning the wisdom, goodness, holiness, and rectitude of the government of the world. These doubts, the acute *Peter Bayle* strengthened, and declared to be not solvable by reason; and he found himself not satisfied with the arguments for the contrary, adduced by *Jaquelot*, *William King*, and *John le Clerc*. Hence *Godfrey Wm. von Leibnitz* was induced to write his Theodicée; which was received with peculiar satisfaction, and used abundantly by the theologians and philosophers of the Wolfian school. The later investigations on this subject, appear to aim less at justifying the existence of evil in the world, than at denying the fact that evil exists. At length *Kant* endeavored to show, that no attempt to evince the justice of God in the admission of evil, could succeed.

Notices. *P. Bayle*, Dictionaire historique critique; Art. Paulliciens, Manichéens. Reponse aux questions d'un Provincial. *Jean le Clerc*, Defense de la Providence, contre les Manichéens; in his Parrhesiana; T. I. p.303. *Wm. King*, De origine mali; Dubl. 1702. Bremae 1704. also in English, about 1730. *Is. Jaquelot*, Conformité de la foi avec la raison; Amst. 1705. 12mo. Essais de Theodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme, et l'origine du mal; par *M. Leibnitz*; Amst. 1710. 8vo. 1734. II vol. 8vo. in German, by Gottsched, 1744. 8vo. *Ge. Bernh. Bilfinger*, de origine et permissione mali; Tub 1724. On the Origin and design of evil; (in German, by *Villaume*,) Lips. 1784–87. III Vol. *Adam Weishaupt*, Apology for disagreeables and evils; (in German,) Francf. and Lips. 1790. II vol. *J. G. C. Werdermann*, New attempt of a Theodicée; (in German,) Lips. 1784. III vol. Essay of a history of opinions respecting fate and human freedom; Lips. 1793. On the permission of evil; in (Junge's) Philosoph. and theological papers; Vol. I. p. 35 –152. On the failure of all philosophical attempts in Theodicée; (in German,) by *Imm. Kant*; in his Miscell. writings, vol. III. p. 145 &c.

Sec. 171. *Immortality of the soul.*

History. Essay of a historical and critical survey of the doctrines and opinions of our principal modern philosophers, concerning the immortality of the soul; (in German,) Lips. 1796. 8vo.

In opposition to the materialism, which Hobbes and others set up, *des Cartes* conceived more distinctly the idea, that the soul was a simple and purely spiritual substance. *John Locke*, had let drop the thought, that God was *able*, to impart the power of thinking, to a material body. This thought was eagerly seized, by some English and French writers, in order to declare man a mere machine, who at death would be completely destroyed. *Julius Offrey de la Mettrie* advanced these views, the most boldly. The Wolfian philosophy furnished arguments, both for the immateriality and immortality of the soul; but the Kantean philosophy, left the first problematical, and rested the last solely on moral grounds. Also the doctrine of immortality, in a comfortless form, as a protracted existence, without consciousness and personality; met with friends and advocates.

Notices. *La Mettrie*, L'homme machine; à Leiden 1748. 12mo. L'homme plante; à Potsdam 1748. 12mo. *Jo. Gust. Reinbeck*, Philosophical thoughts on the rational soul and its immortality; (in German,) Berlin 1739. *Gottl. Is. Canz*, Convincing proof of the immortality of the soul; (in Germ.) Tub. 1744. (*Geo. Fred. Meiers*, Thoughts on the state of the soul after death; (in Germ.) Halle 1746. 8vo.) *Mos. Mendelsohn's* Phaedon; (German,) ed. 4. Berl. 1776. (*C. Spazier*, Antiphaedon, or examination of some principal arguments for the simplicity and immortality of the soul; (German,) Lips. 1785.) *Abr. Gotth. Kastner*, Elucidation of an argument for the immortality of the soul; (German,) Gotting. 1767. *Isaac von Pinto*, Pith of the argument against the materialists; with notes by J. C. E. Mümler; (in German,) Helmst. 1778. *Joh. Fred. Häseler*, Julius, or, on the immortality of the soul; (in Germ.) ed. 2. Brunsw. 1794.

L. H. Jakob, Evidence of immortality, from the idea of duty; (German,) ed. 2. Züllich. 1794. (Examination of the proof proposed by Professor Jacob; (in German.) Lips. 1793.) Elpizon, or, on my continuing to be, after death; (in German; by *C. F. Sintenis;*) ed. 2. Lips. 1804–5. III vol. 8vo. Euthanasia; three dialogues on the life after death; (in German,) by *C. M. Wieland,* Lips. 1805. 8vo.

Sec. 172. *Belief in Revelation.*

After *Ludovicus Vives* and *Philip de Mornay, Hugo Grotius* holds a distinguished place, among the defenders of christianity(A). The distinction between natural and revealed religion, was contested by the *Socinians;* who maintained, that all religious doctrines must be comprehensible, by reason, but that all become known to us, only by revelation. In these principles, they were followed by *Gruner* and *Basedow.* The earlier theologians placed the use of reason very low; and in this, they were preceded by *Luther's* severe opinion. On the contrary, the English deists(B) took opposite ground; exalted the value of the religion of reason, and thence inferred, either that christianity was not needed, and was superfluous; or that, being contrary to reason, it was to be rejected. To meet these arguments(C), the English apologists asserted the coincidence of the christian doctrines with the religion of reason; and thence inferred the truth of the former. Others, however, chose to found this truth, on the weakness and insufficiency of reason. *Leibnitz* endeavored to defend the coincidence of faith and reason, against *Bayle's* objections; and in accordance with the Wolfian principles, the necessity of a revelation, and the marks of a real one, were unfolded. Some theologians, however, treading in *Vernet's* steps, avowed only the desirableness and usefulness of a revelation. In confutation of the Jews and the Muhammedans, numerous pieces were written; among which, only *Limborch's* Conference with *Orobio,* deserves to be noticed(D). For a controversy with Pagans, occasion did not occur; yet

learned inquiries respecting their religion, were undertaken(E).

Notices. A. *Jo. Franc. Pici Miranduli.* Examen vanitatis doctrinae gentium et veritatis christianae disciplinae, Lib. VI; Mirand. 1520. *J. Lud. Vives,* de veritate fidei christianae, Libri V; Basil 1544. 8vo. and in his Opp. Basil 1555. T. II. p. 284 &c. *Philippi Mornaei,* de veritate religionis christ. Liber; Antw. 1580. *Hugonis Grotii,* de veritate religionis christ. Libri IV; Paris 1640. et alibi; ex ed. Koecheri, Halae 1734. II. vol. 8vo.

B. *Edwardi Herbert de Cherbury,* de veritate prout distinguitur a revelatione, a verisimili, a possibili et falso; Lond. 1645. (*Charles Blount,*) Religio Laici; 1683. Oracles of reason; 1693. *John Toland,* Christianity not mysterious; Lond. 1696. Adeisidaemon; s. Titus Livius a superstitione vindicatus; Hagae Com. 1709. Nazarenus; Lond. 1718. Patheisticon Cosmop. 1720. *Matthew Tindal,* Christianity as old as the creation; Lond. 1733. and German, with *Jac. Foster's* Confutation; Francf. 1741. II vol. 8vo. The moral philosopher; by *Thomas Morgan;* Lond. 1737–40. III vol.8vo. Christianity not founded on argument, and the true principle of the gospel evidence assigned; Lond. 1742. *Thomas Chubb,* Posthumous works; Lond. 1748. The philosophical works of *Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke;* Lond. 1754. V vol. 4to. *John Leland,* View of the principal deistic writers; (in German,) Hanov. 1755–56. III vol. La vie de Mahomed; par *Henri de Boulainvilliers;* A Londres 1730. Letters sur la religion essentielle à l'homme distinguée de ce, qui n'en qu'accessoire; (par *Marie Huber;*) Amst. 1738. II vol. 8vo. *Marie Arouet de Voltaire,* L'evangile du jour; la philosophie de l'histoire; dictionare philosophique portatif, &c. in his Works; Gotha 1784. LXXI vol. The Encyclopaedists &c.

C. *Ja. Abbadie,* Traité de la verité de la religion chretienne; Roterod. 1692. II vol. 8vo. à la Haye 1763. III vol. 8vo. and in English, I vol. 12mo. *J. Locke,* The reasonableness of christianity; Lon. 1693, 1703. French: Amst. 1731. II vol. 8vo. A defense of revealed religion

by *J. Conybeare;* Lond. 1732. and German; Berlin 1759. The strength and weakness of human reason; by *Isaac Watts;* Lond. 1736. and German; ed. 2. Halle 1755. The advantages and necessity of the christian religion, shown from the state of religion in the ancient heaheathen world; by *John Leland;* Lond. 1764. II vol. 4to. and in German, abridged, vol. I. Gotha 1769. 8vo. Eusebius; or, the true Christian's defense; by *I. Chapman;* Lond. 1739. II. vol. 8vo. and German; by Steffens; Hamb. 1759. II vol. 8vo. *George Benson,* Reasonableness of the christian religion; Lond. 1743. and German; by *I. Pet. Bamberger*; Halle 1763. The analogy of religion natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature; by *Joseph Butler;* ed 4. Lond. 1750. and German; ed. 2. Tub. 1779. 8vo. A view of the internal evidences of the Christian religion; by *Soame Jenyns;* Lond. 1776. German; by *Vollbroth*; Gott. 1776. 8vo. A view of the evidences of Christianity, in three Parts; by *William Paley;* Lond. 1795. II vol. 8vo. and German; Lips. 1797. II vol. 8vo.

Blaise Pascal, Pensées sur la religion; Paris 1669. 12mo. *Petri Dan. Huetii,* Demonstratio evangelica; Paris 1690. Fol. Amst. 1694. 4to. *Ejusd.* Quaestiones Alnetanae de concordia rationis et fidei—cum ejusdem Commentariis de rebus ad eum pertinentibus; Lips. 1719. 4to. Traité de la verité de la religion chretienne tiré en partie du Latin de M. *Jean Alfonse Turretin;* par *Jaques Vernet,* à Geneve 1730–46. VII vol. 8vo. La religion chretienne prouvée par des faits par l'Abbé *Houtteville;* à Amst. 1743. IV. vol. 12mo. Lettres de quelques Juifs Portugais et Allemands à M. de Voltaire; (par *Ant. Guenée;*) Paris 1769. and German; 1773. also English. *Abrecht von Haller,* Letters on some objections of certain living Free-thinkers, against revelation; (in German,) ed. 2. Bern 1778. III. vol. 8vo. Genie du christianisme, ou beautés de la religion chretienne; par *François Auguste Chateaubriand;* Paris 1802. V vol.

D. Tela ignea Satanae;—in lucem protrusit *Jo. Ch. Wagenseilius;* Altorfi 1681. 4to. *Philippi a Limborch,* de veritate religionis christianae amica collatio cum erudito Judaeo; Goudae 1687. Basil 1740. 8vo.

E. *Edward de Cherbury*, de religione gentilium errorumque apud eos causis; Amst. 1708. 8vo. *Gerhardi Jo. Vossii*, de theologia gentili et phisilologia christiana, Libri IX. ed. 3. Francf. ad Moen. 1675. 4to. *Tobiae Pfanneri*, Systema theologiae gentilis purioris; Basil 1679.

Sec. 173. *Most recent history of belief in revelation.*

The infidelity propagated from England and France into Germany, called forth many writings in confirmation of the truth and divine origin of christianity. The *Wolfenbuttle Fragments*, and the controversies respecting them, appear to have had a decided influence in shaping men's views of the nature of revelation. For, from this time onward, it became more manifest, that most theologians either wrapt up the idea of a revelation in equivocal obscurity, or had recourse to a distinction between mediate and immediate revelation. The *Kantean* philosophy was applied, in various ways, in order to sustain faith and a revelation; but with as little success, as may be expected to attend the more recent attempts, to trace *all religion* back to a divine revelation. The *Tübingen* school, however, stands alone, in holding fast the old and pure idea of revelation, unaltered.

Notices. Gotth. Ephr. Lessing's Contributions to history and literature, derived from the treasures in the library at Wolfenbuttle; (in German,) 3d and 4th Contribut. 1777. On the aim of Jesus and his disciples; (in Germ.) 1778. The remaining and unprinted works of the Wolfenbuttle Fragmentists; (inGerman,) published by Schmid (Andr. Riem.) 1787. *J. Gottl. Fichte*, Criticism on all Revelations; (in German,) ed. 2. Konigsb. 1793. Critical theory of revelation; (in German.) Halle 1793. *Imm. Fred. Niethammer's* Essay to establish a rational belief of revelation; (in German,) Lips. 1798 &c.

C. L. Nietzsch, de revelatione religionis externa eaque publica; Lips. 1808. 8vo.

F. Steudel, On the tenableness of faith in a historical revelation from God; (in German,) Stutg. 1814. 8vo.

Recent Apologies: Theod. Ch. Lilienthal, Revelation a good thing, proved and vindicated against the enemies of it; (in German,) Konigsb. 1750–78. XVI vol. 8vo. *Charles Bonnet's* philosophical examination of the evidences of Christianity; (in German,) translated, and notes added, by *I. C. Lavater*, Zurich 1769. *Aug. Fred. W. Sack*, The faith of a christian vindicated; (in German,) Berlin 1773. VIII Parts. *J. A. Noesselt*, Defense of the truth and divinity of the christian religion; (in German,) ed. 5. Halle 1783. 8vo. *G. G. Less*, On the christian religion, its history, choice and confirmation; (in German,) ed. 2. Gotting. 1786. II vol. 8vo. also in English. *J. Fred. Kleucker's* New examination and elucidation of the principal arguments for the truth and divinity of christianity; (in German,) Halle 1787–94. III vol. The truth and divinity of christianity briefly stated; (in German,) Hamb. 1803. 8vo. *J. S. Franke*, Attempt of an Apology for the christian religion; (in German,) Altona 1817. 8vo.

Sec. 174. *Miracles and prophecies.*

Miracles were ever viewed, as one principal evidence of christianity; and it therefore excited great attention, when *Thomas Woolston* (d. 1733) attempted to explain the miracles of Christ allegorically. Concerning the object and the idea of a miracle, two eminent philosophers, *Isaac Newton* and *Leibnitz*, entertained different views; yet both admitted the possibility of miracles. On the contrary, the Scotchman, *David Hume*, and the Genevan citizen, *John James Rousseau*, came forth subtle opposers of miracles. After the Englishman, *Conyers Middleton*, had confined miracles to the apostolic age, *J. Casper Lavater* maintained the uninterrupted continuance of miraculous powers in the christian church. In the most recent times, the voice of those who reject miracles, generally, has been raised both often and loud. Many theologians have attempted to explain the miracles, on natural principles; others, following *Spinoza* and *Locke*, define a miracle, so indistinctly, and with such latitude, that a miracle may easily be conceived of, but would be an insignificant thing. The question has also been dis-

cussed, whether Jesus aimed to establish his doctrine, by miracles; and, whether miracles can be made to prove any doctrine whatever. Among all miracles, that of the resurrection of Jesus, has been most dwelt upon, and vindicated against the objections of opposers.—The proof from the prophecies of the Old Testament, was treated as holding a high rank, till the time that *Anthony Collins* assailed it. Notwithstanding various answers to him were published, this argument has been more and more laid aside; especially, in consequence of the estimation, which the new theology puts on the predictions concerning the Messiah. In general, it has become more common, since the time of *J. S. Semler*, to rest the truth of Christianity, upon the internal, rather than the external evidences;—yet *J. Fr. Kleuker* and others, have declared against this.

Notices. Bernard Connor, Evangelium medici; Lond. 1697.—*Thomas Woolston*, Six discourses on the miracles of our Saviour; Lond. 1727–29.—*Conyers Middleton*, Free enquiry into the miraculous powers; Lond. 1749. (in German,) with critical remarks, by *C. E. von Windheim;* Hanov. 1751.—A vindication of the Free enquiry; Lond. 1751.—*Dav. Hume*, Essay on miracles; Lond. 1764.—(Dissertation concerning miracles; by *George Campbell;*—also in French, by *J. de Castillon;* 1765.)—*J. J. Rousseau*, Lettre de la montagne, &c. Amst. 1764.—(Remarks on the miracles of the Gospel, in answer to the objections which J. J. Rousseau has raised against them; German, from the French, of *M. Claparede;* Francf. 1774.)—Free remarks on the doctrines of miracles and a revelation, in Letters to a friend; (German,) 1792.—Review of the decision respecting miracles and a revelation; (in German,) by *Sam. Ritter;* in Henke's New Magazine, vol. I. p. 206.—Apology for faith in miracles and revelation; (in German,) by *Hünerwadel;* in Flatt's Magazine for christian dogmatics and morals, Pt. VIII. p. 140 &c.—*Jo. Ch. Eck*, An attempt to explain the history of the N. Test. miracles, from natural causes; (in German,) Berlin 1795.—*Geo. Laur. Bauer*, Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Test. (in

Germ.) Lips. 1802–03. II vol. 8vo.—Would Jesus have miracles and signs, to be considered as proofs of his divine mission; (German,) in *Eckermann's* theol. Contributions, vol. V. P. II.—Did Jesus declare his miracles, to be a proof of his divine mission; (German,) by *Storr;* in Flatt's magazine. Pt. IV.

J. F. C. Gräffe, Philosophical defence of the miracles of Christ and his Apostles; (Germ.) Gott. 1812. 8vo.

Muzel, On belief in the miracles stated in the N. Test. (German,) Elberf. 1815. 8vo.

Reinhold: in Schuderof's new Journal &c. (German,) vol. II. P. 2.

Humphrey Ditton, The truth of the christian religion demonstrated, from the resurrection of Jesus Christ; German from the English. Brunsw. 1749.—*Gilbert West*, Remarks on the resurrection of Jesus; German from the Engl. Berlin, 1748.—*William Sherlock*, Trial of the witnesses of Christ's resurrection: German from the English. Lips. 1751.—*G. Less*, History of the resurrection of Jesus; (German,) Gott. 1779.—*J. D. Michaelis*, Explanation of the history of Christ's burial and resurrection; (in German,) Halle 1783.—The fifth fragment, from G. E. Lessing's fourth Contribution to history and literature; with notes by *J. D. Michaelis;* (Germ.) Halle 1785.—(*J. C. Doederlein's*) Fragments and antifragments; (German,) new ed. Nurnb. 1788. II vol.—*J. Fred. Plessing's* History of the resurrection of Christ, reconsidered; (German,) Halle 1788.

Anthony Collins, Discourse on the grounds and reasons of the christian religion; Lond. 1724.—Defence of christianity from the prophecies of the O. Test. by *Edward Chandler;* Lond. 1725. 8vo.—An essay on the truth of the christian religion, wherein its real foundation upon the O. Test. is shown; by *Arthur Ashley Sykes;* Lond. 1725.—The use and intent of prophecy, in the several ages of the church; by *Tho. Sherlock;* Lond. 1725. 8vo. and German; by Fr. Eberh. Rambach, Lemgo 1749, 8vo.—*Eckermann's* Theolog. Contributions; (Germ.) vol. I and II.—*G. Fr. Seiler*, Prophecy and its fulfilment; (German,) 1794. 8vo.

W. C. L. Ziegler's Conclusion, that the evidence of the truth and divinity of the christian religion, is to be derived rather from the internal excellence of its instructions, than from miracles and prophecies ; (German,) in Henke's Magazine, vol. I. P. I.

Sec. 175. *Views concerning the Holy Scriptures.*

That the holy Scriptures were divine, and contained divine instruction, was admitted unanimously, by all christians. In respect to the Canon, the Protestants differed from the Catholics, by discarding as Apocryphal the books of the Old Testament found only in Greek and Latin, which the Council of Trent again adjudged to be canonical. In regard to the Canon of the New Testament, the Protestants followed, for the most part, the old views ; yet some, among whom was *Luther*, allowed themselves in very free remarks respecting several books accounted canonical. The divine inspiration of the Bible, was admitted as certain ; and yet the nature of inspiration was never determined by the church. Hence the Protestant and Catholic theologians fluctuated between more strict and more lax views, between an inspiration of both the words and the matter, and an inspiration of the matter only. Yet the former idea was the prevailing one, among the Protestants ; and especially, as it seemed to promise them some advantages in their contests with the Catholics ;—but *George Calixtus* and others departed from it. On the contrary the *Socinians*, and likewise the *Arminians*, limited inspiration to a much narrower compass. *Richard Simon*, on account of his critical investigations, was considered by most theologians, as hostile to the holy Scriptures ; and yet he did not advance ideas so uncommon, respecting inspiration, as *Benedict Spinoza*, and one of Simon's opposers, *John le Clerc*, brought forward. In Holland it was debated, whether the divinity of the holy Scriptures, could be proved from reason alone.

Notices. Acgidii Hunnii, Tractatus de sacrosancta majestate, fide et certitudine Sacr. Script. Francf. 1694. 8vo.

—*Henr. Bullingeri,* de Script. sacrae auctoritate, certitudine, firmitate, et absoluta perfectione, Libri II; Tiguri 1538.—*Sam. Bocharti,* Epistola ad Tapinum, qua Scr. sacr. divinitas demontratur;—in his Opp. T. I. p. 923.—*Ben. Spinozae,* Tractatus theologicus; Hamb. (Amst.) 1670. 4to.—Histoire critique du vieux Testament; par *R. Simon;* à Roterod. 1685. Sentimens de quelques theologiens de Hollande sur l' Histoire critique du vieux Testam. (par *J. le Clerc*); Amst. 1685. 12mo. in German; Zurich 1779, II vol. 8vo.—Reponse au livre intitulé: Sentimens &c. par le Prieur de *Bolleville* (R. Simon); Roterod. 1686. 4to.—Defense des sentimens de quelques theologiens; Amst. 1686. 12mo.—De l' inspiration des livres sacrés; par le Prieur de Bolleville; Roterod. 1699. 4to.—*Jo. Hen. Maii,* Dissertt. IV. de Scriptura sacra; Francf. 1708. 4to.

Sec. 176. *Recent views in Germany.*

In Germany, about the middle of the eighteenth century, the criticism of the Bible had made considerable advances, when investigations were renewed, respecting its Canon. *John Sol. Semler* commenced them, and also assailed the common ideas of inspiration; by which he would understand, the practical effect of the biblical doctrines. With more calmness and distinctness, *John Gottlieb Toellner* endeavored to explain the nature of inspiration, and to establish the different gradations of it. The consequences of these investigations were, that the more recent theologians distinguished, more accurately, the christian doctrine (the word of God) from the Bible; that they considered the latter, not so much as one entire revealed record, as a collection of writings, in which every man must perceive the peculiar characteristics and modes of thinking of the respective writers; that they endeavored, by means of the higher criticism, to ascertain the origin and compilation of the scriptures; and that they considered them, as containing (μυθους) fictions or allegories. The most recent theology, on the part of *Semler* and *Steinbart,* seems visibly inclined, to undervalue the Old Testament; and likewise to feel,

that the application of the higher criticism, unless guided by fixed principles, will easily degenerate into a capricious play with mere possibilities.

Notices. *Jo. Sol. Semler*, Treatise on a freer investigation of the Canon; (in German,) Halle 1771–75. IV vol. 8vo.—*Chr. Fred. Schmidii*, Historia antiqua et vindicatio canonis Vet. et Nov. Test. Lips. 1775. 8vo.—Account of the latest controversies respecting the Canon;—in the most recent history of religion; (in German,) published by *Ch. Fr. W. Walch;* vol. VII. p. 241–344.—The divine inspiration of the holy Scripture; (in German,) by *Jo. Gottl. Toellner;* Mietau and Lips. 1772.—*Jo. Kiddel's* Treatise on the inspiration of the holy Scr. with many free remarks added by Jo. S. Semler; Halle 1783.—The Wolfenbuttle Fragments, and the controversy respecting them, between *Lessing* and *J. M. Goetze;* (in German).—*J. Jac. Griesbach,*) Stricturarum in locum de theopneustia libror. sacrorum, Partes I—V; Jenae 1784–88. *Henr. Gottl. Paulus*, An primitivi christiani inspirationem quam vocant et infallibilitatem pro synonymis habere soliti sint; Jenae 1802. rec. in *J. D. Pott*, Sylloge commentatt. theol. vol. III.—*G. F. N. Sonntag*, Doctrina inspirationis, ejusque ratio, historia, et usus popularis; Heidelb. 1810. 8vo.

CHAPTER II.

DIVERSE VIEWS AND EXPLANATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES.

SEC. 177. *Various first principles of Christianity.*

The representation given of the christian doctrine, must necessarily be very different, according to the sources from which men derive it, and the manner in which they deduce it. The protestant churches set up the rule, that the substance of christianity must be learned, directly from the holy scripture. In opposition to

the Catholics, they therefore rejected the use of tradition, as a guide in explaining the bible, and as one of the proper sources of religious knowledge; and they urged, that the perusal of the bible, should be left free to all christians, without distinction. They moreover rejected the opinion, of certain sects and persons called fanatics, that men must be guided by an internal light, in order to have a knowledge of religion, and a right understanding of the bible. And lastly, they rejected the principle of the Socinians, that the doctrines of christianity must be admitted always, in the sense, in which reason can comprehend them; and that, therefore, no real mystery can have place in it. The modern theology of the rationalists, holds to the principle, that the christian doctrine is to be derived from the bible; but it recognizes in christianity, nothing but natural religion; and reconciles the contradictions of these two principles, by adopting moral interpretations of the bible, after the manner of Kant; or by applying the theory of doctrinal accommodation to the christian instructions; or lastly, by recurrence to the idea, that christianity is a perfectable religion.

Notices. Des traditions et de la perfection de l' écriture sainte; par *Pierre du Moulin;* à Sedan 1631. 8vo.—*Ch. Matth. Pfaffii*, Diss. de traditionum non scriptarum speciebus, valore, certitudine; Tub. 1720. 4to.—*Phil. Marheincke*, On the true sense of Tradition, in the Catholic theology; (German,) in *Daub* and *Creuzer's* Studien, vol. IV. P. II. p. 320 &c.—*Ejusd.* System of the Catholic religion; (in German,) vol. II. p. 184 &c. especially p. 199 &c.—*Gust. Gc. Zeltneri*, Breviarium controversiarum cum enthusiastis et fanaticis adhuc agitatarum; Lips. 1724. 8vo.—*Jo. Musaei*, de usu principiorum rationis et philosophiae in controversiis theologicis; Jen. 1644. 8vo.—On reason and its use; (German,) in (Junge's) Philos. und theologischen Aufsatzen; Nurnb. und Altd. 1779. P. I. p. 1–72.—Observationes ad moralem sive practicam librorum sacror. interpretationem pertinentes; scripsit φιλαληθης Ερισδαινων (*Ch. W. Hebenstreit,*) Lips. 1796. 8vo.—*Paul von Hemert*, On ac-

commodations in the New Test. German from the Dutch; Dortm. and Lips. 1797.—*W. A. Teller's* Religion of the more advanced; (in German,) Berl. 1792.—(*Krug*) Letters on the perfectibility of revealed religion; (in German,) Jena 1795. 8vo.—Programma paschale: Exponuntur quaedam de fundamento theologiae recentioris, ejusque cum doctrina christiana consensu; P. I. Gott. 1812. 4to.

Sec, 178. *Opinions concerning the importance of religious doctrines.*

The violent ferment of feeling, which existed among the theologians of the sixteenth century, led each sect to attach the highest importance to the doctrinal principles it maintained. The Council of Trent laid all dissentients under an anathema; and the authors of the *Formula of Concord*, and the theologians of *Dort*, did not hesitate to condemn their opposers. The discrimination of fundamental doctrines (articuli fundamentales), was developed, in the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed churches, and also in those between the Remonstrants and the Contra-remonstrants: the number of such doctrines was greatly enlarged, and the reception of them considered necessary to salvation. Those who entertained more moderate views,—as the *Arminians*, *George Calixtus*, and various English divines, were denominated *Indifferentists*, *Syncretists*, and *Latitudinarians*. The later modifications of theology, have been accompanied with milder decisions, respecting the pagans, and those of a different belief. To the differences between the two Protestant confessions, less and less importance has been attached; the idea of fundamental articles has been reviewed, and modified variously, and the number of such articles greatly diminished. The close adherence to the symbolical books, which was once required from every protestant divine, was first softened by *Spener*, and since the middle of the eighteenth century, has been visibly on the decline. The obligatory nature of these writings, was disputed by *Germanus Lüdke*, *Büsching* and others;

and subsequently, the religious edict of the Prusian government, A. D. 1788, brought this subject under warm discussion. Previously to this, many of the English divines had written against the xxxix Articles.

Notices. *Nicol. Hunnii,* διαστολις theologica, de fundamentali dissensu doctrinae Lutheranae et Calvinianae; Wittemb. 1626. ed. 2. 1663.—*Ch. Mat. Pfaffii,* Diss. de fidei christianae articulis fundamentalibus ejusque analogia; Tub. 1718. 4to.—*J. A. Eberhard,* New apology of Socrates; (in German,) ed. 2. Berlin 1778. II vol. 8vo. —*W. Fr. Hufnagel,* Programm. de vera articulorum fidei finitione; Erlang. 1783. 4to.—*J. W. Schmid,* On the christian religion; (German,) Jena 1797. p. 127 &c.—*Chr. G. Kupfer,* Diss. de ratione constituendi articulos fundamentales religionis christianae; Viteb. 1802. 4to.

Account of the commotions and contests respecting the symbolical books, in Germany; (German,) in *Walch's* Latest history of religion, vol. II. p. 305–382.—Account of the commotions in England; (in German,) Ibid. vol. III. p. 405–502. Vol. IV. p. 491–572.—Examination of all the writings occasioned by the royal Prusian edict concerning religion; (in German,) by *Henr. Phil. Henke;* Kiel 1793. 8vo.

Sec. 179. *Doctrine of the Trinity.*

The reformers declared themselves disposed, in no respect whatever, to depart from the views of the Trinity, laid down in the ancient Creeds; and they instituted no new investigations of this doctrine, because they had no contests about it with the Catholics. But when opposers of this doctrine rose up, the Protestants supposed, they should secure themselves against suspicion of being connected with these opposers, by expressing the strongest abhorrence of them. The execution of *Miguel Servedo* (Michael Servetus) by *Calvin's* instigation, which *Melanchthon* also approved, is proof, to what a fearful height this hostility had risen. The new sect of *Unitarians,* set up by *Fausto Sozzino* (Faustus Socinus), was assailed

by both Protestants and Catholics; because it recognized only one God, the Father; and accounted Christ a mere man, though endowed with extraordinary abilities, and constituted the Governor of the world; and held the Holy Ghost, to be a mere attribute, or operation of God. *George Calixtus* was accused of favoring the Socinians; because he denied, that the doctrine of the Trinity could be proved from the Old Testament, and that it was a doctrine known to the ancient Jews. After the Socinians were driven from Poland, and had dispersed themselves in England and Holland, deviations from the common faith on this doctrine, became more frequent. *Samuel Crell* followed the views of the Socinians, respecting the Trinity. *William Whiston* revived Arianism; which he supposed he could prove, both from the bible, and from history. *Samuel Clarke* searched for a middle way, between the Arian and the received doctrine: but his system of subordination, dexterous as he was to defend it, gave satisfaction to neither party. *Souverain* pronounced the whole doctrine of the Trinity, to be a corruption of christianity, derived from the Platonic philosophy. Against these and other opposers of the Trinity, arguments were employed, which were derived from the Bible, from philosophy, and from history; and in the controversy, some who attempted to explain the Trinity, fell under the suspicion, either of Tritheism, as *William Sherlock;* or of Sabellianism, as *Hermann Deusing*, *John Wallis*, and *John le Clerc;* though the last of these, afterwards, inclined towards Socinianism. The peculiar views of *Paul Maty*, excited more attention than they merited. During these various controversies, several English divines began to attach less importance to this doctrine,—in which, they were preceded by the Remonstrants; and the Genevan theologians were loudly accused, for having abandoned the Creed once so strenuously defended by John Calvin.

Notices. Mich. Serveti) De Trinitatis erroribus, Libri VII; 1531. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Dialogorum de Trinitate Li-

bri II; 1532. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Christianismi restitutio; 1553. 8vo.—Socius, and other works, in the Bibliotheca Fratr. Polonor.—*Geo. Calixti* Diss. de mysterio Trinitatis; an ex solius Vet. Test. libris demonstrari queat; Helmst. 1646.—*Will. Whiston's* Primitive christianty revived; Lond. 1711, 12. V vol. 8vo.—*Sam. Clarke,* The scripture doctrine of the Trinity; Lond. 1712. in German, with a preface, by *J. S. Semler;* Francf. and Lips. 1776. 8vo.—(*Dan. Waterland's* Vindication of Christ's divinity; Cambr. 1719. 8vo.)—*Hermanni Deusingii,* Revelatio mysterii sacrosanctae Triados; Franeq. 1701. 4to.—*Will. Sherlock,* Vindication of the doctrine of the holy Trinity; Lond. 1690. 4to.—*Jo. Wallis,* Epistolae et Orationes sacrae de Trinitate;—*Liberii de S. Amore* (*le Clerc*), Epistolae Theologicae; Irenop. 1679. 8vo.—Historia critica novae explicationis dogmatis de tribus in Deo personis, quam vir clariss. *Paulus Maty* excogitavit, &c. in *J. L. Mosheim's* Dissertt. ad hist. eccles. pertinent; vol. II. p. 399 &c.

Sec. 180. *Views of the modern German divines.*

Various theologians, who followed the principles of the Wolfian philosophy, attempted to demonstrate the doctrine of the Trinity, or at least to make it conceivable to reason; but they did not escape the charge of approximating to Sabellianism. From the time that *Christ. Tob. Damm* openly maintained the Socinian views, in opposition to the doctrine of the church, a great diversity in opinion showed itself. *J. B. Basedow* defended the Arian doctrine; but afterwards he went over to the Socinians. Some respectable theologians, as *G. Schlegel* and *Loeffler,* gave the preference to the *modal* conception of it. The new theories of *Urlsperger* and *Bucerus,* met with no approbation. Although the prize question by the King of England, respecting the divinity of Christ, led to no decision of the subject; yet the doctrine of the church, has not been without learned defenders, as *Ge. Fr. Seiler,* and *J. F. Flatt.* Amidst all the dissimilarity of opinion on this subject, the modern theologians seem to have become agreed, after the example of *Toellner,*

in ascribing to no one of the different theories, so high importance, as was formerly ascribed to them.

Notices. *G. Schlegel's* Renewed consideration of the doctrine of the Trinity; (in German,) Riga 1791–93. III vol.—*Ejusd.* Simplified exhibition of the doctrine of the Father, Jesus the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit; (in German,) Berlin and Stralsund 1795.—Christology, or Results of the latest exegetical explanations concerning the divinity of Christ; (in German,) by *Fred. Euchar. Oertel;* 1792.—(Contributions for answering the question, Whether faith in Christ as the supreme God, accords with scripture? in some remarks on Oertel's Christology; (by *Roth;* in German;) 1793.)—*Joh. Aug. Urlsperger's* Concise system of his statement of the Trinity; (in German,) Augsb. 1777.—The mystery of the Trinity in its dangerous situation. A new idea of the Trinity; (in Germ.) by *Christ. Fred. Bucerus;* Lips. 1792.—*J. S. Semler's* Preparation for the royal Brittish prize question, respecting the divinity of Christ; (in German,) Halle 1787. 8vo.—*G. F. Seiler*, On the divinity of Christ: (in German,) Lips. 1775. 8vo.—*J. Fr. Flatt*, Commentatio, in qua symbolica ecclesiae nostrae de deitate Christi sententia probatur et vindicatur; Gotting. 1788. 8vo.—*Besenbeck*, On the trinity of God; an attempt to bring this doctrine back to its biblical simplicity and purity; (in German.) 1814. 8vo.—Is the doctrine of the Trinity a fundamental doctrine of the christian faith? (in German,) in *J. G. Toellner's* Short miscellaneous papers; vol. II. P. I.

Sec. 181. *Doctrine of creation.*

Besides the old question, whether the existence of the world from eternity, or its creation in time, was to be admitted; the account contained in the first chapters of the book of Genesis, called forth new investigations. According to *Astruc's* example, divines began to consider the book of Genesis, as a compilation from the productions of several writers of an earlier age; and also to indulge freer opinions respecting it. At first, attempts were made to defend the account, as being, at least in part, true his-

tory; next, the allegorical, and at last the mythic interpretation, gained the ascendency. That from the Mosaic account, it is impossible to gather the age of this earth, and much more that of the created universe, was admitted almost universally. Yet *John de Luc*, finding this account to agree with the results of the deepest researches into nature, would infer that, it must have been communicated in a revelation from God.

Notices. Critique on the doctrine of creation in the received theology; (in German,) by *W. C. L. Ziegler;* in Henke's Magazine, Vol. II. P. I. and Vol. VI. P. II. (*Astruc,*) Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont il paroit, que Moise s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genèse: à Bruxelles 1753. 8vo.; and German; Francf. 1783. *J. G. Rosenmülleri,* Antiquissima telluris historia; Ulm 1776; and in German, with enlargements; Nürnb. 1782. *J. G; Herder's* Most ancient records of the human race; (in German,) vol. I. 1790. *Gabler's* New essay on the Mosaic history of the creation; (in German,) 1795. The most ancient Theodicée, or Explanation of the three first chapters of Genesis; (in German,) by *W. A. Teller*; Jena 1803. *Joh. Esai. Silberschlag,* Geogony; (in German,) Berlin 1780–83. III vol. 4to. *J. de Luc,* Lettres physiques et morales sur l'histoire de la terre et de l'homme; à la Haye 1779. II vol. Lettre aux auteurs Juifs d'un memoire addressè à M. Teller; par *J. de Luc;* Berlin 1799. Moses and David no geologists; (in German,) by *Dav. Jul. Pott;* Berl. 1799.

Sec. 182. *Doctrine concerning Angels.*

The Protestants rejected the long prevalent opinion, introduced by the pseudo-Dionysius, of a celestial hierarchy, and of a guardian angel assigned to every man; but especially, the worshipping of angels. The earlier theology often went into inquiries, whether the angels have bodies, when they were created, and how they became confirmed in goodness by the Deity. The modern theology, on the contrary, leaves the *existence* of angels problematical; and gives other interpretations to the biblical

narrations of the appearance of angels. The belief in evil angels, and in their powerful influences, was long common with Protestants and Catholics; till *Balthasar Becker*, though amidst great contradiction, denied the influence of evil spirits upon mankind, and *Christian Thomasius* disproved the reality of magic. Following in the steps of the Englishmen *Arthur Ashly Sykes* and *Hugh Farmer*, *J. S. Semler* was the first in Germany, who declared the demoniacs of the New Testament, to be persons laboring under natural disease. In the controversy that ensued, most of the divines inclined to the idea, that the whole doctrine concerning the devil, was merely an accommodation, derived from Judaism.

Notices. Critique on the doctrine of angels; (in German,) in *Henke's* Magazine, vol. III. P. II. vol. VI. P. I. Compare the New Magazine, vol. I. P. III. *Balth. Becker*, The world bewitched; (in Dutch,) Leuw. 1690. Amst. 1693. 4to. (in German,) by *J. M. Schwager;* Lips. 1781. III vol. 8vo. *Hugh Farmer*, Essay on the demoniacs; (German, from the English,) Berlin 1776. *J. S. Semler*, Diss. de daemoniacis, quorum in evangeliis fit mentio; Halle 1760. 4to. ed. 4. 1779. (*G. Müller's* Well grounded narrative of a woman possessed; (in German) Wittenb. 1759.) Account of John Joseph Gasner's league with the devil, and the movements, thence occasoned; (in German,) in *Walch's* Most recent history of religion; vol. VI. p. 369 &c.

Sec. 183. *Of the person of Christ.*

In regard to the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, the Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed, all remained true to the ancient belief, as defined by the decrees of Councils; but the *Socinians*, in consequence of their ideas of the Trinity, wholly rejected it. The two Protestant churches fell into a warm contest, respecting the connexion of the two natures of Christ. In order to vindicate his views of the Lord's Supper, *Luther* threw out the idea, that the body of Christ, in consequence of its union with the divine nature, could be *omnipresent*

Whether he was led to this conclusion, by some assertions of a similar nature, made by *John Charlier Gerson* and *James le Fevre d'Etaples*, is uncertain. This hypothesis, which Luther himself seems afterwards to have given up, was eagerly laid hold of by some of his zealous followers, and by *John Brentius* was prescribed to the Würtemburg church. The communication of divine properties to the human nature of Christ, notwithstanding the opposition of the Reformed and of Melanchthon's school, was made an article of faith, by the Formula of Concord. And in later times, there has not ceased to be opposition to the doctrine, disagreement in the explanation of it, and contests about its application. In more recent times, contention on this subject has subsided; and the collective decisions of the church, concerning the person of Christ, have been treated rather historically, than dogmatically.

Notices. *Planck*, History of the Protestant theology; (in German.) A catalogue of the writings, in *Pfaff's* Historia Literar. T. II. p. 412 &c. 441—43.

Sec. 184. *Doctrine concerning the first men.*

On all the doctrines relating to the nature of man, sin, grace, redemption, and the divine decrees, the first reformers aimed to restore the pure tenets of Augustine; and to divest them of the adulterations and modifications, introduced by the Schoolmen. The Protestants therefore believed, that God created man after his own image, which consisted in original righteousness; but that this image was utterly lost, by the fall. The *Socinians*, on the contrary, placed the image of God, in dominion over the creatures; and maintained, the continuance of it after the apostasy. Of late, the high ideas heretofore prevailing, respecting the perfection of the first human beings, have been greatly lowered; and the Mosaic account of the creation, and of the transgression of the first men, has been re-

garded, as either partially or wholly a fignrative representation, or as being an ancient fable or fiction.

Notices. Fred. Ulr. Calixti, Tractatus theolog. de vario hominis statu. Helmst. 1695. 4to. (*Is. Peyrerii*, Praeadamitae; 1655. 8vo.) *Fausti Socini*, Disput. de statu primi hominis ante lapsum; Racov. 1609. 4to. and in the Biblioth. fratr. Polon. On the perfection of the first men; (German,) in (Junge's) Philosoph. and Theolog. papers, vol. I. p. 207. On the propagation of the divine image, and on the apostasy, and its consequences; (in German,) Ibid vol. II. p. 1 and 153. *Eichhorn's* History of the creation; (in German,) published by *J. Ph. Gabler*, II vol. 8vo. 1792–93. (Hadriani Beverland, Peccatum originale κατ' ἐξοχην sic dictum; Eleutherop. 1678. 8vo. Eden: that is, Contemplations on Paradise, and the events that transpired there; (in German,) with a preface, by *C. F. Bahrdt;* Francf. 1772. 8vo.

J. Kant, Supposed commencement of the history of man: (German;) in the Berlin Monthly Journal, vol. VII. P. I.

The allegorical exposition of the three first chapters of Genesis, and particularly of the apostasy, represented in their falsehood; (in German,) by *J. Balth Lüderwald;* Helmst. 1781.

J. G. Rosenmüuller, Explanation of the history of the apostasy; (German,) in the Repertory for biblical and orient. literature; vol. V. p. 158 &c.

The most ancient Theodicée; or explanation of the three first chapters of the Ante-Mosaic history; (in German,) by *W. A. Teller;* Jena 1805. 8vo.

Sec. 185. *Hereditary sin.*

The doctrine of the Protestant churches respecting hereditary sin, was as strong, as Augustine ever advanced; for, the milder statements of *Zwingle*, were not regarded. It did not indeed deprive men avowedly of liberty; but it made them absolutely unfitted to perform any thing morally good, and deserving of damnation. It was decided, however, in the Formula of Concord, in opposi-

tion to Matthias Flacius, that hereditary sin is not a part of the substance of man. The Council of *Trent*, on account of the prevailing differences in the bosom of the Catholic church, did not venture to establish a definition of hereditary sin; so that different explanations of it, continued to be given; for the *Dominicans* and *Augustinians* held more closely with Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, while the *Franciscans* and *Jesuits* departed farther from them. The *Socinians* rejected hereditary sin, altogether: and the *Arminians* would not allow of a connate desert of punishment, and an unfitness for what is good. Attempts were made, in the Protestant churches, to render the imputation of Adam's sin more comprehensible. *Joshua de la Place* rejected the immediate imputation of it; but his idea was not embraced, by his own church, or that of Switzerland. At last, several voices were raised in England, against hereditary sin; as those of *John Locke*, *Thomas Burnet*, and *John Taylor*. *Daniel Whitby* would derive the universal prevalence of sin, from man's mortality; which Adam's transgression had brought upon all his posterity. In Germany, the foundation for a change of sentiments, was laid by the Leibnitzian-Wolfian philosophy; and subsequently, *Toellner* and *Eberhard* directly assailed the doctrine of hereditary sin, and its imputation: and notwithstanding *Seiler*, and others, advocated the other side; it became more and more common, to trace the sinfulness of mankind, not from the apostasy of Adam, but as *Jerusalem* does, from the influence of the senses. Even those theologians, who, like *Reinhard* and *Storr*, continue to maintain the existence of hereditary sin, have abandoned the old doctrine of the church, in some very important particulars. The *Kantean* hypothesis, of a radical evil in human nature, continued no longer, than the charm of its novelty endured: yet it has contributed to establish the principle, that every sin originates from a man's own fault.

Notices. *Jos. Placaei*, Theses de statu hominis lapsi ante

gratiam; Salm. 1640. *Ejusd.* Disp. de imputatione primi peccati Adami; 1655. *Dan. Whithby*, Tractatus de imputatione divina pecati Adami posteris ejus in reatum; Lond. 1711. and revised by *J. S. Semler;* Halae 1775. 8vo. *John Taylor*, The Scriptural doctrine of original sin; in German, from the 3d Eng. ed. Francf. and Lips. 1769. *J. G. Toellner*, On hereditary sin, and the goodness of human nature; (in German,) in his Theological Inquiries, Vol. I. P. II. Judas Iscariot, or Evil considered in its connexion with Good; (in German,) by *C. Daub;* Heidelb. 1816–18. 8vo. P. I. and P. II. sec. 1 and 2.

Sec. 186. *Grace and predestination.*

On the doctrine concerning grace, *Luther* followed the views of Augustine, in all their extent; and he defended them, with great earnestness, against *Erasmus*. *Melanchthon*, at first, expressed similar sentiments; but he gradually drew back, and would not exclude the personal activity of men. This change in Melanchthon, seems to have reacted upon Luther, who at last, did not disapprove of the idea of his friend; and in his later writings, he speaks of universal grace. The theory of Melanchthon, (that of co-operation,) when advanced by Victorinus Strigel, at Jena, was violently assailed by *Matthias Flacius*, and his coadjutors. In the mean time, *John Calvin*, though not without strong opposition, had introduced into the Genevan church, the doctrines of unconditional decrees, and of special grace; which were either discarded, or esteemed unimportant, by the first Swiss reformers; and he was able to gain over the other Swiss divines, to these doctrines. Between one of his adherents, *Jerome Zanchius*, and *John Marbach*, a Lutheran divine of Strasburg, a contest ensued, on this subject; but it was soon dropped. The *Formula of Concord* excluded the personal activity of man, in his conversion, and rejected the doctrine of co-operation. But, as the authors of this creed, maintained the universality of divine grace, and disapproved of unconditional decrees, they found themselves under an embarrassment; from

which they knew not how to free themselves, though they understood how to conceal it.

Notices. *Des. Erasmi*, Diatribe de libero arbitrio ; s. Collatio cum M. Luthero ; Basil. 1524.—*Mart. Lutheri*, de servo arbitrio Liber, contra Erasmum ; Vitenb. 1525. (cum annotatt. editus a *Seb. Schmidio ;* ed. 2. cum praefatione apologet. *Jo. Joach. Zentgravii ;* Argentor. 1707. 4to.)—*Erasmi*, Hyperaspistes, diatribe adv. Servum arbitr. Lutheri ; Bas. 1626.—On the doctrinal views of the first Reformed divines ; (German,) in *J. Conr. Füsslin's* Preface to the 3d and 4th volumes of his Contributions to the history of the Swiss churches and their reformation.—Consensus pastorum ecclesiae Genevensis de aeterna Dei praedestinatione ; in *Calvini* Opp. T.VII. p. 683.

Sec. 187. *Continuation.*

In the conference of Montbelliard A. D. 1586, the doctrine of election was brought under warm discussion, between *James Andrea* and *Theodore Beża;* and the contest with *Samuel Huber*, completed the separation between the Calvinists and the Lutherans. During these contests, the Lutheran divines discovered, and *Aegidius Hunnius* explained, a way to reconcile the total unfitness of man for what is good, and the sole efficiency of divine grace, with the rejection of unconditional decrees: and this was, to assume that, men can resist preventing grace. In the mean time, warm contests had arisen among the Reformed, especially in the Netherlands. The *Arminians* would not allow the Calvinistic theory, of unconditional election, special grace, irresistable influences of grace, and of saint's perseverance, to be urged upon the whole church. But the erudition of *Simon Episcopius*, and the unwearied activity of *John Wytenbogart*, had to succumb to the power of the opposite party, who were supported by the civil authorities; and the national Synod of Dort, solemnly established those Calvinistic doctrines.

Notices. Acta colloquii Montisbelligartensis ; Tub. 1587. 4to.—*Thodori Bezae*, Responsio ad Acta col. Mont. Ge-

nevae 1587. 4to.—Epitome colloquii Montisbell. Tub. 1588. 4to.—*Aegidii Hunnii*, Tractatus de providentia Dei, et aeterna praedestinatione; Francf. 1597. 8vo.—Acta synodi Dordrechti habitae; Hanov. 1620. 4to.—Acta et scripta synodalia Dordracena ministrorum Remonstrant. Harderv. (1620.) 4to.

Sec. 188. *Further disagreement in the Reformed churches respecting these doctrines.*

Notwithstanding the decisions at Dort, diversity of opinions continued. Those decisions approved the sentiments of the *Infralapsarians;* and also, did not reject those of the *Supralapsarians*. The *Brandenburg* divines acknowledged the universality of grace. And in *France*, likewise, a hypothetical universality was held forth, by *John Cameron* and *Moses Amyraud;* approved, by the French synods at Alençon A. D. 1637, and *Charenton* A. D. 1645; warmly contested, by *Andrew Rivet* and others; and defended, by *John Daillé* and *David Blondel*. The Dutch theologians looked upon this opinion, as very suspicious; and the Swiss divines endeavored, to guard against it, by the Formula Consensus. In England, the Episcopal church, more and more, went over to the doctrine of universal grace; and even the Swiss, after the time of *Alphonsus Turretin*, began either to abandon the old particularism, or to consider the whole subject of the controversy, as unimportant. In Germany, *Lange* and *Waldschmidt* exchanged the last controversial pieces, on this subject; and even *Samuel Endemann*, strongly as he once held to the doctrinal views of his church, did not hesitate, to reject the doctrine of unconditional decrees, with most of its dependant doctrines. (The very recent attempts at union of the Lutherans and Reformed in Germany, have occasioned a renewed examination of these doctrines, by the holy Scriptures.)

Notices. *Jo. Cameronis*, Defensio de gratia et libero arbitrio; Salmur. 1624. 8vo.—Traité de la predestination et de ses principales dependances; par *Moyse Amyraud;*

Salm. 1634. 8vo.—*Fred. Spanheimii*, de gratia universali Disputatio; Lugd. 1644.—*Andreae Riveti*, Synopsis doctrinae Mosis Amyraldi et Paulli Testardi de natura et gratia, cum Riveti considerationibus et judiciis academiarum foederati Belgii :—in *Riveti* Opp. T. III. p. 828.—*Jo. Dallaei*, Apologia pro duabus ecclesiarum in Gallia protestantium synodis nationalibus; Amst. 1655. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Vindiciae Apologiae; Amst. 1657. 8vo.—*Sam. Strimesii.* Charitologia sacra, seu Systema gratiae divinae, id est, conciliationis gratiae Dei universalis et particularis tentamen; Francf. ad Viadr. 1712. 4to.—La souveraine perfection de Dieu et la parfaite integrité de l' ecriture prise au sens des anciens Reformés, defendue par *Gabriel Naudé;* Amst. 1703. II vol. 8vo.—*Steph. Viti*, Apologia, qua synodus Dordracena et reformata fides ab iniquis criminationibus—vindicatur; Cass. 1726. 8vo.—*Joach. Lange*, Evangelical doctrine of universal grace; (in German,) Halle 1722. 8vo.—*Ejusd.* Firm ground of the Evangelical doctrine of the universal grace of God; (in German,) Halle 1735. 8vo.—*Joh. Jac. Waldschmidt*, Saving grace of God, with rejection of the universal grace of God, shewn from the holy Script. (in German,) Marpurg 1735. 8vo.

W. F. Rink, Contribution to an investigation of the Lutheran and Reformed doctrines concerning the holy Eucharist and *Election*, according to the word of God; with a view to a union of the Protestant churches in one Evangelical christian church; (in German,) Heidelb. 1818. 8vo.—*Jo. Schulthess*, Evangelical doctrine concerning the free election of grace; a Contribution to the union of the Evangelical churches; (in German,) Zurich. 1818. 8vo.

Sec. 189. *History of these doctrines in the Catholic church.*

Writers. Memoires pour servir a l' histoire des controverses nées dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la prédestination et sur la grace depuis le concile de Trent;—dans la Bibliotheque universelle et historique (par *J. le Clerc*,) Tome XIV. p. 144–398.—Bajana, seu scripta quae controversias spectant occasione sententiarum Baji exortas;—in *Baji* Operibus, Col. 1696. 4to.—Historia Congre-

gationum de auxiliis gratiae divinae Libri IV ; authore *J. Hyac. Serry ;* Amst. 1709. Fol.—Historiae controversiarum de divina gratia ;—authore *Theodoro Eleutherio ;* (Levino de Meyer,) Libri III ; Antw. 1705. Fol.—*Ejusd.* Historiae—ab objectionibus Hyac. Serry vindicatae. Lib. III ; Brux. 1715. Fol.—Histoire génerale du Jansenisme ; (par *Gabr. Gerberon*), à Amst. 1700. 8vo.

The movements in the Catholic church, respecting the doctrines of grace and the divine decrees, were no less considerable. The *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* retained their different opinions, and continued to contend for them, with the zeal which the reputation of their respective orders called forth. To avoid offending either of these orders, the decisions of the Council of Trent were shaped so equivocally, that each party explained them in its own favor. But the conflict became much warmer, when the Jesuits entered into it, and endeavored wholly to suppress pure Augustanism. It had operated to impair their popularity, that they had procured the Papal condemnation of the tenets of *Michael Bajus.* But when the Jesuit, *Ludovicus Molina,* came forward with a new essay for reconciling divine grace and election, the Augustinians and Dominicans stormed the Papal chair, with complaints against the Jesuits, as corrupters of the true doctrines of the church. The investigations instituted hereupon, by Clement VIII, from the year 1598, in the *Congregatio de Auxiliis,* led to no decision. *Cornelius Jansen* endeavored to vindicate the true doctrine of Augustine, against the assaults of the Jesuits ; and thus gave rise to the *Jansenist* party, which opposed the most determined resistance to the Jesuits, and could not be extinguished by them, either by means of Papal bulls, or by the aid of the civil arm.—While all the christian churches were contending about divine grace, certain *Mystics* rose up, who attributed the conversion of men solely to an internal operation of God, which had no connexion with the external word, and by which the soul is enlightened, purified, and united with God.

Notices. *Dominici Soto,* de natura et gratia Libri III; 1548.—*Andreae de Vega,* Commentarii in aliquot concilii Tridentini decreta; Complut. 1548.—*Ludovici Molinae,* Liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia; Olyssipone 1588. 4to. Antw. 1595. 4to.—*Cornelii Jansenii,* Augustinus; Lov. 1640. Fol.—Traité de la nature et de la grace; par *Nicol. Malebranche;* Roterod. 1684.—Reflexions philosophiques et theologiques sur le nouveau systéme de la nature et de la grace; par *A. Arnauld;* 1685.—Nodus praedestinationis dissolutus; a *Coelestino Sfondrati;* Romae 1696. 4to —Acta constitutionis Unigenitus;—edidit *Christ. Matth. Pfaffius;* Tub. 1721.

Sec. 190. *Of the influences of the word of God.*

With the doctrine concerning grace, enquiries respecting the word of God, were intimately connected. Both the Protestant churches were agreed, that God effects the conversion of men, by means of his word. The word of God, was divided into the Law and the Gospel; and the relations of these two, occasioned what was called the *Antinomian* controversy. That the external word was not to be undervalued, or to be accounted void of power, was decided in the contests with *Schwenkfeld* and *Herm. Rathman;* and those were called fanatics, who thought otherwise, or seemed to do so, on this subject. The assertions of the Frencht heologian, *Claude Pajon,* that it is of no importance, to determine the *manner* in which God produces conversion; and that no immediate operation of divine grace, is to be supposed; were rejected by the Dutch and French churches. In the Lutheran church, the similar views of *Ernest Schubert,* that the power of God's word is only logical and moral, and not supernatural, were warmly resisted, by *Ernest Augustus Bertling,* and others.

Notices. The orthodox, correct, and incontrovertible doctrine of the theologians belonging to the pure, genuine, evangelical church, and to the unaltered Augsburg Confession, respecting the holy Scriptures, or the holy, re-

vealed word of God, again stated; (in German,) Lips. 1619. 4to.—Censures and reflexions of the theological faculty, respecting Thom. Rathmann's books; (German,) Jena 1626. 4to.—(Respecting Pajon, see *Chaufepied*, Dictionaire, Tome II. Art. Céne).—*J. Ernest Schubert*, Instruction concerning the power of the holy Scripture; (in German,) Helmst. 1753.—*Ern. Aug. Bertling*, Statement, of what the Lutheran church teaches, and does not teach, respecting the power of the holy Scripture; (in German,) Dantzig 1756. 8vo.

Sec. 191. *Most recent form of the doctrine of grace.*

In the new state of dogmatics, various attacks have been made, upon the constituent parts of Augustine's theory respecting grace; in which, both philosophy and history have been put in requisition. *J. Aug. Eberhard*, especially, called in the aid of the former; and *Semler*, that of the latter. After *Michaelis* had questioned the supernatural operations of Grace, *Junckheim's* calm and deliberate investigations produced a very great effect. *Storr* defended the immediate operations of grace. One consequence of the recent investigations, was, that the distinction between the word of God and the bible, was more clearly made. Against the excessive value, which some attach to religious feelings, *Spaulding* has published a work.

Notices. (*Junckheim,*) On the supernatural in the operations of grace; (in German,) Erlang. 1775. 8vo.—*G. C. Storrii;* Diss. de Spiritus S. in animis hominum efficientia; Tub. 1777.—*Ejusd.* Treatise on the operations of grace; (in German,) Tubing. 1779.—(*Joh. Joach. Spaulding.*) On the value of the feelings in christianity; (in Germ.) ed. 4. Lips. 1773. 8vo.

Sec. 192. *Redemption by Christ.*

The Protestants embraced in their creed, the old idea, of a satisfaction, which Christ made to God, by means of his sufferings and obedience. In this doctrine, they became fixed, in consequence of the opposition of the

Unitarians, who considered the death of Christ, as merely an *example*, and a means of confirming the truth of his doctrines. Yet *George Karg*, *Zacharias Ursinus*, and *John Piscator*, receded from the common opinion, that the active *obedience* of Christ was vicarious; and the French Protestant church finally concluded, to tolerate this deviation of Piscator, while the Swiss churches rejected it. *Grotius* defended some parts of the received doctrine, against Socinus, yet giving it a different modification; and he was attacked, not only by *John Crell*, but also by the Reformed divine, *Hermann Ravensperger*. The attack of the latter, was parried by *Gerhard John Vossius*. The *Arminians*, and afterwards some English theologians, as *John Tillotson*, *Edward Stillingfleet*, and *John Leland*, advanced the opinion, that the merits of Christ were a full *equivalent*, for the guilt of men. Some mystics, as the *Quakers*, who were in this followed by *Conrad Dippel*, looked upon the sufferings of Christ, as an *emblem* of the change, which the human soul must undergo, in order to become pure and pleasing to God.

Notices. *Fausti Socini*, Disputatio de Jesu Christo servatore; hoc est, cur et qua ratione J. C. noster servator sit; 1594. 4to. *Hugonis Grotii*, Defensio fidei catholicae de satisfactione, adv. Faustum Socinum; Lug. Bat. 1617. 8vo. and cura Joach. Langii; Halae 1730. 4to. *Herm. Ravenspergeri*, Judicium de libro Grotii de satisfactione Chr. Gronng. 1617. 4to. *G. J. Vossii*. Responsio ad Judicium Herm. Ravenspergeri; Lugd. 1618. 4to. and in his Opp. T. VI. p. 883. *Jo. Crellii*, Responsio ad librum H. Grotii, quem de satisfactione scripsit; Racov. 1623. 4to.

Sec. 193. *Continuation.*

While some English divines, as *John Taylor* and *Anth. Ashley Sykes*, were advancing new theories respecting the atonement, the Germans remained true to the earlier belief, and endeavored to support it by philosophical arguments. Yet *J. Aug. Ernesti* rejected the representation of a three-fold office of Christ. By his critical in-

quiries respecting the active obedience of Christ, *John Gottl. Toellner* caused the idea of it, to be almost universally given up. *S. Steinbart*, *Joh. Aug. Eberhard*, and others, ascribed the forgiveness of sin to the death of Christ, only in so far, as this death contributed to reform sinners, and thus, indirectly, procured them forgiveness of their sins. *George Fred. Seiler*, and *G. Christ. Storr*, defended the earlier opinion. *Jos. Fred. Loeffler* declared the doctrine of satisfaction for sin, to be untenable; and he considered the biblical doctrine of the sin-offering made by Christ, to be the mere dress of the idea, that the first christians had no reason to fear punishment, for the sins they had committed in their former state of Paganism and Judaism. Others perceived in the death of Christ, an emblematic representation, and a sensible confirmation, of the fact, that God is ready to forgive sinners. But, in general, theologians have ceased to regard any particular explication of this doctrine, as essential to christianity.

Notices. The scripture doctrine of atonement examined; by *John Taylor;* Lond. 1751. 8vo. and in German, Francf. 1773. *Anthony Ashley Sykes*, The doctrine of the Holy Scripture concerning the redemption of men by Jesus Christ; German, from the English; Francf. 1777. *Jo. Aug. Ernesti*, Programm. de officio Christi triplici: in his Opuscul. ed. 2. Lips. 1792. The active obedience of Christ, investigated; (in German,) by *Joh. Gottl. Toellner*; Breslau 1768.—Additions thereto; (in German.) Berlin 1770. 8vo. Most recent history of the doctrine of, what is called the active obedience of Christ; (German,) in *Walch's* Latest history of religion. vol. III. p. 309—372.

Geo. Fr. Seiler, On the atoning death of Christ; (in Germ.) ed. 2. Erlang. 1781. II vol. 8vo. (Apologies of reason, supported by rational arguments, in reference to the christian doctrine of atonement; (in German,) Basil 1781.) *J. D. Michaelis*, Thoughts on sin and satisfaction; (in German,) Gott. 1779. *Storr*, On the object of Christ's death; (German,) in his Explanation of the Epistle to the Hebrews; Tub. 1789.

Jos. Fr. Chr. Loeffler, Two essays on the received doctrine of satisfaction; (in German,) Züllich 1796. 8vo. *F. Wunder*, De justificationis morti Christi tributae universalitate; Vitenb. 1790. *Stäudlin*, On the object and the effects of Christ's death; (German,) in the Gotting. Library of the latest theolog. literature; vol. I. Philosophic and exegetical inquiries respecting the doctrine of reconciling men with God; (in German,) by *Charles Christ. Flatt;* Gott. 1797. II vol. 8vo. Philosophic and critical sketch of the doctrine of atonement; (in German,) by *J. Gottf. Aug. Kroll;* together with some thoughts on the same subject, by *J. H. Tieftrunck;* Halle 1799. The conflict of reason with herself in the doctrine of atonement, stated and solved; (in German,) by *W. Tr. Krug;* Zülich. and Freist. 1802.

G. M. L. de Wette, De morte J. C. expiatoria commentatio; Berol. 1813. 4to. (Jesus, at first, expected his doctrine of a heavenly divine kingdom, would meet the approbation of his countrymen. But the result showed, that he expected too much, from his disciples and the people at large. Therefore he, at last, voluntarily died, in order to procure a triumph of this doctrine.)

Is a distinct idea of the work of redemption, necessary? (in German,) in *Toellner's* Theological Inquiries. vol. I P. I. p. 199.

Sec. 194. *Justification.*

One grand point, to which the Reformers attached special importance, and on which they deviated from the ancient church, was the doctrine of justification. In the first place, they attached a new idea to it; making it to consist, not in the communication of righteousness, but in freeing a person from the guilt and punishment of sin. Secondly, they placed the meritorious ground (causa meritoria) of justification, solely in the merits of Christ; and excluded all human satisfactions for sin, as unnecessary and worthless. And thirdly, they considered faith as the only means (instrumentum,) whereby a man can partake of the merits of Christ, and so obtain forgiveness of sin. The Council of *Trent* rejected the Protestant tenets;

and in the contests, which ensued on all these points, there were frequent misapprehensions, and bitter mutual reproaches; which were met in vain, by full confessions of faith, and extended explanations, set forth by the theologians. It was also contested, whether a person can be conscious of his own justification: and, whether he can prepare himself to become justified.

Notice. On the formation of our orthodox symbolical doctrine concerning justification: (German,) in *J. Fr. Flatt's* Magazine for christian Dogmatics and Moral. P. I. p. 219.

Sec. 195. *Continuation.*

Luther's theory was embraced and maintained, by the Protestants, with such firmness, that *Andreas Osiander*, —who understood justification, to be making a person actually righteous, although he deviated from others, more in the use of terms, than in substance,—stirred up universal opposition, from the Lutheran divines. His statement of this doctrine, together with his position, that Christ was the Redeemer of men, only in his *divine* nature; as well as the opposite position of *Francis Stancarus*, that the work of redemption was predicable only of the *human* nature of Christ; were rejected, in the Formula of Concord. Afterwards, the Protestant theologians continued, to defend the ideas of justification contained in their symbols; not only against the Catholics, but also against the *Socinians*, the *Arminians*, and certain English divines. In the *Cocceian* controversy, the question came up, whether the pious under the Old Testament, obtained the same remission of sin, with the christians: and in the *Pietistic* debates, inquiry was instituted, whether the bestowment of grace, is limited to any certain period [of a man's life], after which it has no place (controversia terministica). Since the last controversy, between *G. Fr. Seiler* and *E. I. Danov*, respecting the difference between justification and predestination; the modern German divines have, for the most part, forsaken Luther's form of

the doctrine; and either defined, in various ways, the biblical idea of justification, or gone into the general inquiries whether, and how, the forgiveness of sin is possible.

Notices. *Theoph. Coelest. Piper*, Programm. quo Socinianorum de justificatione placita strictim exponit; Gryphsw. 1795. 4to. Controversy between *Danov* and *Seiler*, respecting the doctrines of justification and predestination; (in German,) in the Latest religious events. vol. I. Giessen 1778 p. 265—300. *F. G. Süskind*, On the possibility of remitting punishment, or forgiving sin; (German,) in Flatt's Magazine. P. I. p. 1. comp. P. IX. p. 71. Is the forgiveness of sin, a postulate of reason? answered by *J. H. Tieftrunk;* (in German,) in Stäudlin's Contributions to the philosophy and history of religion. vol. III. p. 112. The question of hesitating reason; Is forgiveness of sin possible? Is a gracious remission of sin to be expected from God? answered by *G. Fr. Seiler;* (in German,) Erlang. 1798. 8vo. *I. Aug. Noesselt*, Programm. de eo quid sit condonare peccata; Halae 1792. 4to. Is the removal of punishment, to be understood as being that forgiveness of sins, which the New Testament promises? an exegetical inquiry: (in German,) by *Süskind;* in Flatt's Magazine. P. III. p. 190, P. IV. p. 76. Attempt to vindicate the doctrine of justification; (in German,) by *Lewis Wachler;* in *Gabler's* Journal for select theol. Literature, vol. IV. p. 229—265.

Sec. 196. *Faith and good works.*

The established creed of the Protestant church, makes the conviction which leads the christian to apply the merits of Christ to his own case, to be the chief part of faith: on the contrary, the Catholic creed makes faith to be the cordial reception of the christian doctrine. While the former acknowledges, that faith *will* produce good works, it denies to those works all *merit* (meritum ex condigno et congruo); and rejects absolutely, all works of supererogation; and in particular, the value of monastic vows. The tenet, that good works are necessary to salvation, was objected to, as a fault in *Melanchthon's* school, and particularly in *George Major:* and *Nicholaus von Ams-*

dorf opposed it, with the opposite position, that good works are prejudicial to salvation. Both positions were rejected, in the Formula of Concord; yet, in the *Syncretistic* and *Pietistic* controversies, the question of the necessity of good works, again came up. In France, *Lewis le Blanc* fell under suspicion of inclining to Catholicism, because he declared the various conclusions formed, respecting the necessity of good works, to be a mere contest about words. In the *Socinian* theology, the relations of faith and good works, must, necessarily, be differently viewed. Also the *Arminians*, and many *English* theologians, considered faith, to be embracing and obeying the christian doctrine; and in this, they are followed by most of the modern German divines.

Notices. That the proposition; Good works are prejudicial to salvation,—is a correct, true, and christian proposition, and was preached by St. Paul and by Luther; asserted; (in German,) by *Nicolas von Amsdorf*. 1559. 4to. —*Fred. Will. Dresde*, Fidei in causa salutis humanae ratio et necessitas denuo asserta et ab adversariorum criminationibus vindicata; Dissertatt. II. Vitenb. 1790. 4to.—Discourse on the festival commemorative of the reformation; (in German,) Octob. 31, 1800. by *F. V. Reinhard*. 1800.

Sec. 197. *Penance.*

Luther, at first, would have penance retained, as a sacrament; and even in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, it is represented as such; and made to consist in sorrow for sin, and faith. So much the more earnestly, did the Reformers contend against the old ideas of penance. They rejected auricular confession; although the Lutheran church retained a private confession, of a different form. They moreover declared themselves, opposed to all satisfactions for sins; and in particular, against fasting, pilgrimages, and flagellations. And lastly, they denied the judicial power of priests, in God's stead, to declare men's sins forgiven. Indulgences, they regarded as a shocking incongruity; which the love of

power, and the avarice of the Popes, had introduced and kept up. In the Catholic church, the old doctrine of penance, was minutely explained, by the Council of Trent, and the departures from it laid under anathema. Among the Catholics, there was afterwards controversy, respecting the nature of penance, and of *attritio* and *contritio*. In the Lutheran church, the question was brought up, and decided in the Formula of Concord, whether penance was a *legal* transaction, or also an evangelical one. The *United Brethren* retained the chief features of the Protestant theology, respecting penance, and the whole dispensation of divine grace; yet they annexed some peculiarities of their own. The more recent Protestant divines have endeavored, to examine more accurately the sources of repentance, or of a change of mind; and the characteristics of that sorrow for sin, which is connected with it; and they have also greatly lowered down, those high views of the power of the keys.

Notices. *Petri Molinaei*, De poenitentia et clavibus, Liber; Sedan 1652. 8vo.—*Jo. Musaei*, Tractatus theologicus de conversione hominis peccatoris ad Deum; Jenae 1661. 4to.—*Jo. Launoii*, Liber de mente concilii Tridentini circa contritionem et attritionem in sacramento poenitentiae; Paris 1653. 8vo —*J. F. Cotta*, Ecclesiae Romanae de attritione et contritione contentio, ex historia dogmatum delineata; Gotting. 1739. 4to. and, in *Gerhardi* Locis Theolog. T. VI.—Penance and faith; (German,) in *J. G. Toellner's* Theolog. Inquiries. vol. I. P. II.

Sec. 198. *The sacraments.*

After the year 1519, *Luther* directed his attention to reforming the doctrine of the sacraments; and he would allow nothing to be a sacrament, to which there was not an express promise annexed, for faith to rest upon. In the subsequent years, he declared himself more fully on this subject. He contested the idea, that the administration of the sacraments, in itself, and without the exercise of faith, produced salutary effects; and he rejected

the sacraments of Confirmation, Marriage, priestly Orders, and extreme Unction. In regard to marriage, in particular, he censured the numerous impediments to it, introduced by the church; and also the prohibition of marriage to priests. Afterwards, the Protestants admitted but two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; while the *Council of Trent* established the *seven* sacraments. The Catholic doctrine concerning the power of the sacraments, ex opere operato, was explained by the Protestants, in a worse sense, than the Catholic church understood it. In the sacraments, the *Lutheran* divines discovered *the medium* by which grace operates; the *Reformed*, the *sign* and *pledge* of grace; and the *Socinians*, an external *rite*, by which a man professed himself a member of the christian church; and here the modern theologians of Germany follow the Socinians. Concerning the sacraments of the Old Testament, various investigations were occasionally made, and especially by the *Cocceian* school. The *Mystics* and *Fanatics* attributed little or no value to the sacraments.

Notices. *Martini Lutheri*, Liber de captivitate Babylonica; Wittenb. 1520.—*Aegid. Hunnius*, De sacramentis Vet. et Novi Test. praecipue de baptismo et coena Domini; Francf. 1595. 8vo.—*Jo. Maldonatus*, De septem sacramentis ecclesiae Romanae; Ludg. 1614. 4to.—*J. Dav. Heilmanni*, Diss. finiendae justae sacramenti notioni; in his Opusc. Tom. I. p. 4.

Sec. 199. *Baptism.*

Luther was of opinion, that the doctrine concerning Baptism, had been preserved in the church, more free from corruption, than those of the other sacraments; and he censured, only the limitation of its efficacy, by the many satisfactions devised for sins after baptism; and that its efficacy should be ascribed to the external *act*, and not be placed solely in *faith* on the divine promises. After the commencement of the reformation, the Protestants had occasion, to evince the correctness of infant

baptism, against the Baptists, who spread themselves in several countries. The *Socinians* would not discard infant baptism; yet they denied its Apostolic origin; and they doubted, whether baptism was required of *all* christians. The *Quakers* rejected water-baptism, altogether; on the ground, that Christ instituted only spiritual baptism. Between the Lutherans and the Reformed, various points were debated; relative to the efficacy of baptism,—whether it *imparted* regeneration and forgiveness of sin, or only *exhibited* and assured us of them;—also relative to the necessity of baptism, and the state of unbaptized infants; and likewise, the faith of children, and the exorcism, which was long retained in the Lutheran church. —Of late, many Lutheran divines have either given up the decisions of their forefathers, or interpreted them in a milder manner. The theologians of both confessions, have begun to limit themselves, by holding, that infant baptism is not clearly founded in the New Testament, yet, that it is not inconsistent with the christian religion; and some have uttered the opinion, that baptism is no institution of Christ; or at least, that it was intended, only for the Jews and Pagans of former times, who embraced christianity.

Notices. In addition to the works mentioned sec. 99 and 100: see *Gerh. J. Vossius*, Dissertatt. xx. de Baptismo; in his Opp. T. VI.—*Fausti Socini*, Disp. de Baptismo aquae; Racov. 1613. and in his Opp. T. I. p. 707.—*Antonii van Dale*, Historia baptismorum, cum Judaicorum tum Christianorum: annexed to his Diss. super Aristea de LXX. interpretibus; Amst. 1705.—Christian Baptism an estimable rite, but no divine institution; (in German;—by *Reiche*,) Berl. 1774. 8vo.—*Joh. El. Troschel*, The water-baptism of Christians, an institution of Christ, and not an arbitrary rite; (in German,) Berl. 1774. 8vo.—On baptism; a candid investigation, occasioned by the progress of the age; (in German.) Lips. 1802. 8vo.—*C. F. Eisenlohr*, Historical observations on Baptism; (in German,) Tub. 1804. 8vo.—*Reiche*, De baptismi origine et necessitate; Gotting. 1816.

Sec. 200. *Common doctrine of the Protestant churches, respecting the Lord's Supper.*

The reformers declared, with one voice, that it was precisely in the doctrine of the Eucharist, that the greatest and most corrupt falsification had been introduced; and from which, that institution must be purged. Hence, they contested the doctrine of transubstantiation, as unscriptural, and unknown to christian antiquity; and they rejected all the consequences derived from it, especially the adoration of the elements. They looked, with abhorrence, on the Mass, the private Masses, and the Masses for the dead; considered as religious consecrations. They introduced the use of the vernacular languages, in the celebration of the Eucharist; and they discarded, some more, and some fewer of the ceremonies, which before accompanied it. They moreover, declared it an unsufferable abuse, that the cup should be withheld from the laity; contrary to the ordinance of Christ, and the usage of the whole ancient church. On the other hand, the *Council of Trent* established the old doctrines; and condemned the dissenting views of the Protestants. They asserted, that the church has a right, according as it shall see fit, to concede or to deny, the use of the cup to the laity; maintained, that it is not necessary, for children, to partake of the communion; and disapproved and forbid some abuses, which had crept into the Mass. On all these points, the contest between the theologians of the two communities, was carried on with the greatest bitterness; and with arguments which they derived from the Bible, from history, and from philosophy.

Notices. *Philippi Mornaci*, de sacra Eucharistia, Libri IV; Francf. et Hanov. 1605. Fol.—*Claud. Espencaei*, de Eucharistia et ejus adoratione, Libri V; Paris 1573. 8vo. —*Jac. Dav. du Perron*, Traité du saint sacrament de l' eucharistie; Paris 1622.—*Jo. la Placette*, Traité de l' autorité des sens contre la transubstantiation; Amst. 1700.—See also the polemic works, mentioned sec. 102, and 142.

Sec. 201. *Dissension among Protestants, during Luther's life.*

While *Luther* rejected the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, he believed, that the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, in the eucharist, was not to be given up. As he was assailed on this point, by *Andreas Carlstadt;* so *Zwingle* also found occasion, first in a private letter, and then in his Commentarius de vera et falsa religione, to state *his* views; which were, that the bread and wine are *symbols* of Christ's body. *John Oecolampadius* coincided with him, except in one unimportant particular; and became involved in controversy, on the subject, with some Suabian preachers. Soon after, Luther and Zwingle, themselves got into controversy; which was waged with considerable warmth, and which involved an enquiry into the omnipresence of Christ's body. The Landgrave *Philip* of Hesse, in vain, attempted to effect a union of the two reformers, by means of the Conference of Marpurg A. D. 1529. In the *Augsburg Confession*, the real presence of the body of Christ, was asserted; dissent was disapproved; and the cities of upper Germany, which believed with Zwingle, were excluded from subscribing. Yet, at length, the *Wittenberg Concord*, of 1536, was concluded, between the theologians of upper Germany and those of Saxony; and so much was effected, that the sacramental contest was, for a long time, at rest. It was indeed renewed by Luther, not long before his death; but the other Lutheran divines took no part in it. During the controversy between the Swiss and the Saxon reformers, *John Caspar Schwenckfeld of Ossingk*, deviated from the tenets of the latter.

Notices. Andr. Carlstadt, Exposition of the words of Christ: This is my body; (in German.) Basil 1525. 4to.—*Luther*, Against the heavenly Prophets; (in German,) 1525. 4to.—*Zwinglii*, Ep. ad Matth. Alberum; 1524.—*Ejusd.* Commentarius de vera et falsa religione; Tiguri 1525.—*Ejusd.* Subsidium de Eucharistia; 1525.—*Jo. Oecolampadii*, De genuina verborum Domini, Hoc est corpus me-

um, juxta vetustissimos auctores expositione; (Basil 1525)—Syngramma clarissimorum, qui Halae Suevorum convenerunt, virorum super verbis coenae Domini; Halae Suevor. 1525. 4to.—*Jo. Occolampadii*, Antisyngramma; 1526. 8vo.—*Luther's* Sermon on the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, against the enthusiasts; (in German,) 1522.—*Zwinglii* Amica exegesis, seu expositio eucharistiae negotii; 1527.—*Luther's*, That the words of Christ; This is my body; still stand fast, against the enthusiastic spirits; (in German,) 1527.—*Zwingle's* Reply; That the words: This is my body, will eternally have their ancient and only meaning; (in German,) 1527. —*Luther's* Confession respecting the Lord's Supper; (in German,) 1528, &c.

The Augsburg Confession, Art. X. de coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes (quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in coena Domini).

Sec. 202. *Progress of the controversy after Luther's death.*

In the opinion of very many Protestant divines, at the head of whom was *Melanchthon*, the question in debate, continually sunk in importance.—*John Calvin* approximated towards the Lutheran tenet; by allowing, that there was a participation of the real body of Christ, in the eucharist; though not with the lips, yet by faith; and he gained over the assent of the divines of Zurich, (A. D. 1549). Yet *Joachim Westphal* renewed the contest; and gradually, others took part in it; so that the bitterness waxed greater and greater. Calvin's opinion prevailed, in the Palatinate; but Melancthon's school, at Wittenberg, which more and more openly inclined to Calvin's views, was destroyed; and thus the real doctrine of Luther, was set forth in the Formula of Concord, in connexion with the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's body, and a condemnation of Calvinism.

Notices. Consensio mutua in re sacramentaria ministrorum Tigurinae ecclesiae et Jo. Calvini; in *Calvini* Opp. T.

VIII.—*Petri Martyris* Vermillii, de sacramento eucharistiae in schola Oxoniensa tractatio; Tiguri 1552.—*Jo. Westphal*, Farrago confusanearum et inter se dissidentium opinionum, ex Sacramentariorum libris congesta; Magd. 1552.—*Ejusd.* Recta fides de coena Domini; 1553.—*Ejusd.* Collectanea sententiarum Augustini de coena Domini; Ratisb. 1555.—*Jo. Calvini*, Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis; Genev. 1555 &c.—Exegesis perspicua controversiae de coena Domini; Wittenb. 1574.

Sec. 203. *Later history of this doctrine.*

The disagreement of the two Protestant churches, as to this doctrine, continued on; and was generally regarded, as very important; and the contests about it, were kept up. In England, Bp. *Benjamin Hoadley* met with opposition, because he seemed to depreciate the importance of the Lord's supper. The Lutheran doctrine was repeatedly attacked, by members of the Lutheran church: among these, the posthumous work of *Heumann* excited most notice, and called forth many confutations. Yet the dexterity with which *Ernesti* defended the Lutheran views, could not prevent *many* theologians, of his church, from either abandoning those views, altogether; or so modifying them, as to destroy their essential character; nor could he dissuade *all*, from estimating the importance of those views, far lower. The Reformed divines, of late, have held more to *Zwingle's* ideas, than to those of Calvin. Some projects for union, by taking a middle course, have received little attention.

Notices. *J. Fr. Buddaei*, Recentissimarum de coena Domini controversiarum sylloge;—in his Miscell. Sacr. T. II. p. 61–88.—*Benj. Hoadley's* Plain account of the nature and end of the sacrament of the Lord's supper; Lond. 1735.—*Chr. Aug. Heumann's* Proof, that the doctrine of the Reformed church, respecting the Lord's supper, is the true doctrine; (in Germ.) Eisleben and Wittenb. 1764. 8vo.—*J. Aug. Ernesti*, Brevis repetitio et assertio sententiae Lutheranae de praesentia corporis et sanquinis J. C. in coena sacra; Lips. 1765. 4to. and

in his Opusc. Theol.—Sketch of a new proof of the interpretation, given to the words of consecration by the Lutheran theologians; (in Germ.) in *J. G. Toellner's* Miscellaneous papers, Collect. II. p. 173–236.—The belief of St. Paul respecting the Eucharist; (in German—by *Holzapfel,*) Francf. 1779—(*Ejusd.*) Confirmation and elucidation of Paul's belief concerning the Eucharist; (in Germ.) Francf. 1780.—*J. C. Erbstein,* Three tracts on the Eucharist; (in Germ.) Berlin 1780.—Some Theses on the doctrine of the holy supper; (in Germ.) Berlin 1781.—Remarks and elucidations on certain theses concerning the holy supper; (in Germ.) by *J. Balth. Lüderwald;* Helmst. 1783.—The holy supper of Christians; (in Germ.) by Dr. *Henr. Stephani;* Lanshut 1811. 8vo. —(That is my Paschal body, which is distributed among you; or the meat of the covenant. That is my blood of the covenant, which I pour out to you (ἐκχυνομενον).

Sec. 204. *The church.*

The doctrine concerning the church, was a grand subject of controversy, between the Catholics and the Protestants. The latter rejected the positions, that there is but one church of Christ; from the visible communion of which, no one can separate, without forfeiture of salvation; and that the church is an infallible lawgiver. and judge, in matters of faith and conduct; and that even the belief of christianity, must rest on the authority of the church. They traced the distinction, between the visible church and the invisible; and conceded to the former, merely the right, to regulate the forms of worship and to execute church discipline. They also declared Christ, to be the only sovereign of the church; and the pretensions of the Bishops of Rome, to the primacy, to be mere arrogance. And even in the Catholic church, there was disagreement, as to the extent of the Papal power; and two opposite systems were formed, on the subject, called the *ultramontane* and the *episcopal.* The latter was, especially, defended by the French divines; was propagated in Germany, by *Justin Febronius;* and in later times, has gained a decided ascendency.—Catholics and Protes-

tants, moreover, have unitedly maintained, against the fanatical sects, that perfect purity, in its members, is not the sign of a true church; and that the administration of religious ordinances, does not lose its validity, and its efficacy, when performed by a sinful minister. The *Kantean philosophy* led to a philosophical examination of the idea of a church; and some Catholic literati have attempted, by means of it, to evince the infallibility of the church.

Notices. De potestate et primatu Papae, tractatus; subjoined to the Articles of Smalcald; 1537.—*Jo. Musaei*, Tractatus de ecclesia; Jenae 1671. 4to.—*Edmundi Richerii*, De ecclesiastica et politica potestate; Col. 1701. 4to.—*Jo. Launoii*, Epistolae:—in his Opp. ed. Colon. 1731. V Tomi, Tomo V.—Defensio declarationis, quam de potestate ecclesiastica sanxit Clerus Gallicanus; 1682. a *Jac. Benig. Bossuet;* Luxemb. 1730. 4to.—*Justini Febronii*, De statu ecclesiae et legitima potestate Pontificis Romani, Liber singularis; Buillioni (Francf.) 1763–74. IV Tomi, 4to.—*Ejusd.* Commentarius in suam retractationem; Francf. ad. Moen. 1781.—*Petri Ballerini*, De vi et ratione primatus Roman. Pontificum, Liber; Veronae 1776. 4to.—*C. F. Stäudlin*, On the idea of a church, and church history; (in German,) in the Gotting. theol. Biblioth. vol. I. p. 600.—*A Stapfer*, De natura, conditore, et incrementis reipublicae ethicae; Bern 1797. —Religion, revelation, and a church, investigated by pure reason; (in German,) by *Ulr. Peutinger;* Salzb. 1795. 8vo.—Idea biblica ecclesiae Dei; delineavit *Fr. Oberthür*, vol. I–IV. 1790–1817. 8vo.—*J. F. Kleucker*, de J. C. Servatoris hominum, ecclesia et ecclesiis; Kiliae 1817. 4to.

Sec. 205. *State of departed souls.*

The practical misuses, to which the doctrine of purgatory had been carried, made the Reformers too decided, in their opposition to it; while, on the contrary, the council of *Trent* confirmed it; together with that of the efficacy of prayers for the dead; though with some warnings against fabulous tales and avaricious views. To the

idea, of the insensibility of the soul, from death till the resurrection, *Luther* appeared to be not opposed; but when some Anabaptists brought forward that idea, it was contested by *John Calvin;* and it was rejected, in the English Confession, under Edward VI, in the Swiss Confession of 1566, and in that of Scotland. The Protestants believed, that immediately after death, the soul passes, either into heavenly bliss, or into the torments of hell. Many *Socinians* were of opinion, that the soul does not recover its consciousness, and its activity, till its reunion with the body; and various others, English writers, accorded with this sentiment. The learned *Henry Dodwell*, from his ideas of the natural mortality of the soul, of the indispensable necessity of Baptism, and of the exalted privileges enjoyed by the Episcopal church, composed a very singular theory. *William Coward* taught, that the soul dies with the body, and will first awake along with it. *Thomas Burnet* revived the notion of the ancient fathers, concerning a middle state; where the righteous and the wicked have some foretastes of their future conditions, until the general judgment, when they receive fully their punishments and rewards. In Germany, the hypothesis of the soul's insensibility, had some abettors; and even the transmigration of souls, found advocates in *G. E. Lessing* and *J. G. Schlosser;* who were able to give, a refined statement of the doctrine.

Notices. An historical view of the controversy concerning an intermediate state, and the separate existence of the soul, between death and the general resurrection, deduced from the beginning of the Protestant reformation to the present times; (by *Blackburn,*) ed. 2. Lond. 1772. 8vo.—*J. Fr. Cotta,* Recentiores quaedam controversiae de statu animi post mortem; Tub. 1758.—*Jo. Calvini,* Psychopannychia; Aureliae 1534.—*William Coward,* Second thoughts concerning the human soul; demonstrating the notion of the human soul, as believed to be a spiritual and immortal substance, to be a plain heathenish invention; Lond. 1702.—De statu mortuorum et resurgentium tractatus; auctore *Thoma Burnet;* Roterd.

1729. 8vo.—(*Lud. Ant. Muratori*, de paradiso regnique coelestis gloria, non expectata corporum resurrectione, justis a Deo collata; ed. 2. Venet. 1755.)—*Gotth. Ephr. Lessing's* Education of the human race; (in German,) 1780. 8vo.—*J. G. Schlosser's* Conversations on the transmigration of souls; (in German,) Lips. 1781–82. 8vo.

Sec. 206. *Resurrection and general judgment.*

All the principal christian sects, acknowledged a resurrection, and rejected chiliasm. Yet this last doctrine had many friends; among whom were *Amos Comenius*, *Peter Jurieu*, *Thomas Burnet*, *William Whiston*, and others. *Philip James Spener*, and his adherents, taught a refined chiliasm; or the expectation of better times. The characteristics of the resuscitated bodies, gave occasion, for many investigations. According to the most common opinion, men will again possess the same bodies, or at least, the substance of the same bodies, which they had in this life. On the contrary, the *Socinians*, *John le Clerc*, and *Godfrey Less*, believed in the formation of entirely *new* bodies. *Joseph Priestly* placed the resurrection of men, immediately after their death.* Most of the modern German divines, consider the resurrection, as merely a figurative representation; by which the immortality of the soul, is so pictured forth, as to be intelligible to persons unaccustomed to reflection. On the general judgment, likewise, many questions have been raised; and attempts have been made, to ascertain the time when it will take place; but the most recent theology finds in it, only the drapery of the doctrine, that God will render to both good and bad men, a perfect recompense.

Notices. *Henr. Corodi*, Critical history of Chiliasm; (in German,) vol. III. and IV. Zurich 1794. The resurrection of the dead, according to the instructions of the New Testament. An extended essay; (in German,) by *Fred. des Cotes;* Kirchheim Bolanden 1791. The palingenesia of men, according to reason and scripture; (in Germ.) by *Ern. Fred. Ockel;* Mietau and Königsb. 1791. 4to.

* No: he believed the soul to be material; and to die and rise again, with the body. *Translator.*

Sec. 207. *Salvation and damnation.*

The various speculations concerning the place, and the condition, of the blessed and the damned, scarcely deserve to be desbribed. Of more importance is the inquiry, respecting the *duration* of future punishment; on which subject, all the variety of opinions, that existed in former times among christians, still continued. Yet the prevailing sentiment, and that which was expressed in the Augsburg Confession, and in other Creeds, was in favor of the *eternity* of future punishment. This was evinced, not only by proofs from the holy scriptures, but also on rational grounds. The *Socinians*, however, held to a punishment, which would terminate, with the annihilation of the damned. Besides, there were always some, who advocated a full restitution, of all men, to virtue and blessedness; among whom, *John William Petersen*, *Thomas Burnet*, *William Whiston*, *Maria Huber*, and *Petitpierre*, were the most distinguished. Many theologians have begun, to soften down the common representation. *John Tillotson* and *Godfrey Less*, admitted, that God had *threatened* everlasting punishment to the wicked; but they doubted, whether he would execute his threatenings, in their full extent. *James Vernet* believed, that the goodness of God, in remitting punishment, ought not to be circumscribed. The *Wolfian* philosophy was, at first, employed to evince the eternity of hell torments; but it afterwards, led to a confutation of this doctrine; by advancing the principles, that the *justice* of God, is merely his *goodness*, directed by wisdom; and that the grand object of divine punishments, is the reformation offenders. And hence, *J. A. Eberhard*, *B. Basedow*, and *J. F. Grüner*, held forth the reformation and salvation of the damned. Others, have either left the question wholly undecided, or have referred the eternity, mentioned in the scripture, only to *the place* of punishment; or have stopped at the never ending *disadvantages*, which the neglect of repentance in the present life, will bring along with it in the life to come.

Notices. (*William Petersen,*) Μυστηριον ἀποκαταστασεως παντων, i. e. the mystery of the restoration of all things; (in German,) Offenbach 1701–10. III vol. Fol. *Lewis Gerhard,* Systema ἀποκαταστασεως, i. e. the complete idea of the everlasting gospel, concerning the restoration of all things; (in German,) 1727. 4to. The eternity of hell torments, inquired into and considered; by *W. Whiston;* Lond. 1740. 8vo. Les systemes des Theologiens anciens et modernes conciliés, par l'exposition des differens sentiments sur l'etat des ames separées des corps; (par *Mar. Huber,*) à Londres 1729. Three Tracts on hell punishments, with a short account of what happened to M. Petitpierre, in the county of Neufchatel; (in Germ.) Francf. and Lips. 1763. 8vo.

Joh. L. Mosheim, Thoughts on the doctrine of the termination of hell torments; (in German,) Coburg 1728. 8vo. *S. I. Baumgarten,* Vindiciae poenarum aeternarum; Halae 1742. *I. E. Schubert,* Rational thoughts on the eternity of hell torments; (in German,) Jena 1753. 4to. (*I. R. G. Beyer,*) On the punishments of the damned, and their duration; (in German,) Lips. 1782.

THE END.

tion of the ... st esteem ... RAO
anguage ... b ... !
iven as ... the ...
ision of ... s; with ... RATICAL RE... ea

...0 Nos. at 6d. or 30 parts, 1s. each, beautifully printed in double columns, paper, hotpressed, and embellished with superior Engravings; ...

COMPLETE WORKS OF DR. SAMU... J...

...mprising the RAMBLER—IDLER—RASSELAS—L... OF T... POET... MISCELLANIES, &c. with an Essay on his Life an... ...s.

** This Correct University Edition will form 2 beautiful Library ... the smallest mutilation or abridgement, the whole of the 8vo. editi...

...urious Miniature, University Edition, (the smallest ever printed ...bility, with clear and beautiful printing, and embellished wit... Vignette Titles; of the Select

DIAMOND BRITISH

...mprising (without the smallest abridgement,) the Complete ...mired English Authors: viz. MILTON—YOUNG—COWPE... —SHENSTONE—WATTS's LYRICS—BEATTIE—AKENSIDE... —MORE—KIRK WHITE—THOMSON's SEASONS—BUTL...

** These Typographical Gems, the largest of which scarcely exceeds t... ...ize at pocket, from the clearness and beauty of the Type, may be read w... Nos. at 6d. each: each Author, however, being detached, may be had s...

LIST OF WORKS NOW CO...

HISTORICAL SERIES—DRAMATIC SERIES—AND ESSAYISTS.

HUME and SMOLLETT'S HISTORY of ENGLAND: ...mplete in 2 vols. 8vo. with Copious Indexes, Beautiful ...gravings, from SMIRKE, &c. extra boards, 29s.

CONTINUATION of ditto, to the present time, by ... fine Engravings, boards, about 9s.

S... ...ARE'S DRAMATIC WORKS: Complete ... ...utiful Vol. with Plates, extra boards, 16s. 6d.

... ...d DRAMA: Comprising all the best Modern ... vols. uniform with the above, boards, 30s.

SP... ...TATOR: the whole 8 vols. comprised in one ...autifully printed volume, fine Engravings, extra ...ar... 16s. 6d.

TATLER and GUARDIAN: in one vol. uniform with ...e above, fine Engravings, extra boards, 14s.

RAMBLER and IDLER: Uniformly printed in one ...autiful volume, fine plates, extra boards, 9s.

MIRROR: Uniform with the above, and fine plates, ...atly stitched, 4s. 6d.

*** All the other popular Essayists are in progress, and will ...rm a uniform Series, printed in the same economical and ...autiful style, and at prices equally moderate.

JOHNSON'S (Dr.) Complete WORKS, by MURPHY: ...comprising the same, verbatim, as the original edition ... 12 vols. published at £4.4s.) in 2 beautiful vols. boards, ...ith fine Engravings, 21s.6d.

———LIVES of the POETS, one vol. sewed, 5s.6d.

MODERN BRITISH POETS.

DARWIN'S POETICAL WORKS Complete; (same as ...e original edition in 2 vols. published at £3. 3.) comprising the Botanic Garden, Loves of the Plants, and Temple of Nature, with Philosophical Notes, and Engravings, neatly sewed, 7s.

KIRK WHITE'S REMAINS: Comprising the whole ...f his Poems and Letters, (same as the original edition, ...n 2 vols. published at 21s.) neatly sewed, 4s.

COWPER'S POEMS, Complete, and uniform, neatly ...ewed, 3s. 6d.

BURNS'S WORKS, and LIFE, by DR. CURRIE, (same ...s the original edition, in 4 vols. published at £1. 10s.) ...orming one elegant volume, boards, 9s. with portrait.

PINDAR'S (PETER) WORKS; with Portrait, 7s.

BYRON'S (LORD) SELECT WORKS, uniform, 4s.

*** The whole of the above Authors, and including some yet ... progress... will form either 2 or 3 beautiful 8vo. Library ... work is detached and complete in itself.

...CAL WORKS, with his Translation ...

...plete in one v... as the origin... and copious ... and embellish... extra boards, ...

KIRK WH... his Poems an... £1. 1s.) beau... boards, 5s. 6d...

COWPER'... Vignette title...

MILTON'... ditto, extra b...

... ... ditto...

GOLDSMITH'... ...ette title ... ed, ...

THOMSON'... ...SEA...

GRAY'S P... ...MS Com...

YOUNG'S ... ...HT TH...

ditto, extra boards, 2...

BEATTIE'S ...

AKEN... ...DE...

other ... s, ...

SHENS... ...E'...

Vignet... ...e, ...

COLLINS'... ...te...

SOMERV... ...&c...

FALCO... ...CK, ...

BUTLER'S ... with ...

trait, and Vig... ... extra ...

In the ... ress, ... will sh...

GAY'S FA... ...ES, and other ...

MOORE'S B... ...IES for the ...

WATTS's L... ...RIC POEMS ...

MORE'S (HANNAH) ...

after Happiness, and other Poe...

17th Edit. In one neat ... price 2s. 6d. *Bds.*

THE GUID... ...

Author of th...

"Hail, ... La...
The source and glo...
That thy can toil and ...
Secure our youth and ...

*** The amazingly rapid and ex... is the best proof of ... high es... ...d.